

# California



## *Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transgender* **Tobacco Use Survey—2004**

California Department of Health Services  
Tobacco Control Section

Prepared by  
Field Research Corporation



Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor  
State of California

Kimberly Belshé, Secretary  
California Health and Human Services Agency

Sandra Shewry, Director  
California Department of Health Services



California  
Department  
of Health Services

# CALIFORNIA LESBIANS, GAYS, BISEXUALS, AND TRANSGENDER TOBACCO USE SURVEY 2004

California Department of Health Services  
Tobacco Control Section

Prepared by  
Field Research Corporation  
San Francisco, CA

**Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor**  
State of California

**Kimberly Belshé, Secretary**  
California Health and Human Services Agency

**Sandra Shewry, Director**  
California Department of Health Services

This publication was prepared by:

The Tobacco Control Section  
Cancer Control Branch  
Division of Chronic Disease and Injury Control  
California Department of Health Services  
1616 Capitol Avenue, Suite 74.516  
MS 7206  
P.O. Box 997413  
Sacramento, CA 95899-7413

Suggested citation:

Bye L, Gruskin E, Greenwood, G, Albright V, Krotki K. California Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transgender (LGBT) Tobacco Use Survey – 2004. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Health Services, 2005.

# Contents

List of Tables .....	vi
<b>Chapter 1 – Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1 Major Findings .....	1
1.1. Tobacco Use and Cessation .....	1
Smoking Prevalence .....	1
Use of Alternative Tobacco Products .....	1
Lapses and Relapses .....	1
Cigarette Consumption Levels .....	2
Quit Attempts .....	2
Cessation Support from Smoking Restrictions .....	2
Use of Cessation Aids .....	2
Identifying Those Unlikely to Quit .....	3
1.2 Secondhand Smoke Exposure .....	3
Workplace Restrictions and Smoke Exposure .....	3
Home Exposure .....	3
Exposure in Other Settings/Total Exposure .....	3
1.3 Tobacco Advertising and Promotion .....	4
Recall and Appeal of Cigarette Advertising .....	4
Receipt of Free Tobacco Products and Branded Promotional Items .....	4
Attitudes Toward Industry Marketing Issues .....	4
1.4 Exposure to Anti-Tobacco Messages .....	4
Recall and Appeal of Anti-Tobacco Messages .....	4
Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation .....	4
Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control in the LGBT Community .....	4
<b>Chapter 2 – Background/Objectives .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 3 – Methodology .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1 Overview .....	7
2 Definition of Study Population .....	7
2.1 Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals .....	7
2.2 Transgender Persons .....	8
3 Household Screening Questions .....	8
4 Random Digit Dial Sample Design .....	8
4.1 Sample Design and Development .....	9
4.2 Sample Selection .....	10
5 Questionnaire Development .....	11
6 Interviewer Selection, Training, and Supervision .....	11
7 Sample Administration Procedures .....	12
7.1 Telephone Contact Protocol .....	12
7.2 Average Interview Length .....	13

8	Sample Performance/Final Dispositions .....	13
9	Sample Weighting/Preparation .....	13
10	Data Analysis Plan.....	14
11	Sampling Error.....	14
12	Final Data Base and Deliverables.....	15
13	Study Team.....	15
<b>Chapter 4 – About This Report .....</b>		<b>17</b>
<b>Chapter 5 – Major Findings.....</b>		<b>19</b>
1	Characteristics of California LGBT Population: An Overview .....	19
1.1	Identification of the LBGT Populations .....	19
1.2	Basic Demographics for LGBT Subpopulations.....	22
2	Tobacco Use in California LGBT Subpopulations.....	27
2.1	Smoking Prevalence Among the LGBT Population and Subpopulations .....	27
2.2	Smoking Prevalence for Demographic Subgroups.....	28
2.3	Cigarette Consumption Among Current LGBT Smokers .....	35
2.4	Age at Onset of Smoking Among Current LGBT Smokers .....	36
2.5	Smoking Patterns for LGBT Non-Daily Regular and Former Smokers.....	37
2.5.1	Elapsed Time Since Being a Daily LGBT Smoker .....	38
2.5.2	Recent Smoking by Former LGBT Smokers.....	38
2.6	Use of Other Tobacco Products (Cigars, Chewing Tobacco, and Snuff) .....	39
2.7	Cigarette Brand Preference.....	40
2.8	Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey .....	40
2.9	Comparisons to Previously Published LGBT Studies.....	42
2.9.1	Recent Smoking by Former LGBT Smokers.....	42
2.9.2	Current Smoking Among LGBT Men .....	42
2.9.3	Age Group Comparisons for Women .....	43
2.9.4	Age Group Comparisons for Men.....	43
3	Smoking Cessation .....	43
3.1	Cigarette Consumption as a Measure of Nicotine Addiction .....	44
3.2	Quitting History .....	48
3.3	Workplace and Home Smoking Bans .....	58
3.4	Smoking Cessation Assistance .....	58
3.5	Beliefs About Smoking and Quitting Among the Overall LGBT Population.....	64
3.6	Likelihood of Not Quitting Among Current Smokers.....	66
3.7	Likelihood of Relapse by Former Smokers .....	66
3.8	Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey .....	67
3.9	Comparisons with Other Published LGBT Studies .....	68
4	Secondhand Smoke Exposure.....	68
4.1	Incidence of Smoke-free Workplaces.....	69
4.2	Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in the Workplace for LGBT Subpopulations and Demographic Groups .....	72
4.2.1	Exposure by LGBT Subpopulations and Demographic Groups .....	72
4.2.2	Exposure by Smoking Status.....	73

4.2.3	Exposure by Type of Workplace.....	74
4.3	Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in LGBT Homes .....	75
4.3.1	LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions.....	75
4.3.2	LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Smoking Status .....	78
4.3.3	LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Presence of Smoker(s) and Presence of Children .....	78
4.4	Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in Places Other Than Home and Work.....	79
4.5	Length of Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in All Locations Last Week .....	79
4.6	Beliefs About Secondhand Smoke.....	80
4.7	Asserting Nonsmoker Rights .....	81
4.7.1	LGBT Nonsmokers Annoyance with Smoking.....	81
4.7.2	LGBT Nonsmokers Asking Someone Not to Smoke .....	81
4.7.3	How Often Smokers are Asked Not to Smoke .....	82
4.8	Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey .....	83
5	Tobacco Advertising and Promotion .....	83
5.1	Awareness of Media .....	83
5.2	Participation in Promotional Activities .....	87
5.3	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Company Advertising and Promotions.....	90
5.4	Comparison to California Tobacco Survey .....	91
6	Tobacco Control Efforts .....	91
6.1	Recall of Anti-tobacco Message Media .....	91
6.2	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation.....	95
6.3	Support for Additional Taxes on Cigarettes .....	96
6.4	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control Efforts in LGBT Community.....	97
6.5	Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey .....	98
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>– Conclusion and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>99</b>
1	Composition of California LGBT Population .....	99
2	Smoking Behavior .....	99
3	Smoking Cessation .....	100
4	Secondhand Smoke Exposure.....	101
5	Tobacco Advertising and Promotion .....	102
6	The California Tobacco Control Program .....	102
7	The Need for Additional Research .....	103
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>– References.....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Appendices</b>		
A. Survey Instrument		
A.1.	2003 California Survey of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transgender Persons Survey Screener – English .....	111
A.2.	2003 California Survey of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transgender Persons Survey Questionnaire – English.....	119
B.	Variance Measures Table .....	145
C.	Summary Information About Other Published LGBT Studies.....	148

# List of Tables

Table A.	Characteristics of Strata .....	9
Table B.	Comparison of Estimated and Actual Distribution of LGBT Men and Women in California .....	10
Table 1-1a.	Same-Gender Sex Behavior for LGBT Population .....	20
Table 1-1b.	Sexual Orientation and Same-Gender Sex Behavior .....	21
Table 1-2a.	Transgender Gender Identification .....	21
Table 1-2b.	Transgender Sexual Orientation .....	21
Table 1-3a.	Basic Demographics for LGBT Populations .....	22-24
Table 1-3b.	Basic Demographics for LGBT Subpopulations .....	25-26
Table 2-1a.	Smoking Prevalence for LGBT Populations .....	27
Table 2-1b.	Smoking Prevalence for LGBT Subpopulations .....	28
Table 2-2a.	Smoking Prevalence for LGBT Population by Demographic Group .....	29
Table 2-2b.	Smoking Prevalence for Gay/Bisexual Men .....	30-31
Table 2-2c.	Smoking Prevalence for Lesbian/Bisexual Women .....	31-32
Table 2-2d.	Smoking Prevalence for Other LGBT Men .....	33-34
Table 2-2e.	Smoking Prevalence for Other LGBT Women .....	34-35
Table 2-3.	Daily Cigarettes Consumption Per Day by Current LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation .....	36
Table 2-4a.	Age First Cigarette smoked by Current LGBT Smoker by Subpopulation .....	36
Table 2-4b.	Age First Smoked Fairly Regularly by Current LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation .....	37
Table 2-5.	Elapsed Time Since Non-daily and Former Smokers Smoked on a Daily Basis by Subpopulation .....	38
Table 2-6.	Cigarettes Smoked in Last 30 Days by Former LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation .....	38
Table 2-7.	Elapsed Time Since Smoking Regularly for Former LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation .....	38
Table 2-8.	Elapsed Time Since Last Puff for Former LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation .....	39
Table 2-9.	Use of Cigars, Chewing Tobacco, and Snuff .....	39
Table 2-10.	Preferred Cigarette Brand Usually Smoked by Subpopulation .....	40
Table 2-11a.	Comparison of Smoking Prevalence Estimates from 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey with Estimates from Previously Published LGBT Studies .....	42
Table 2-11b.	Women's Smoking Prevalence Estimates by Age Group: Comparison of 2003 CA LGBT Tobacco Survey with Other Published LGBT Studies .....	43
Table 2-11c.	Men's Smoking Prevalence Estimates by Age Group: Comparison of 2003 CA LGBT Tobacco Survey with Other Published LGBT Studies .....	43
Table 3-1a.	Cigarette Consumption Levels of LGBT Smokers .....	44
Table 3-1b.	Cigarette Consumption Levels of LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation .....	45
Table 3-2a.	Light Smokers by Democratic Group .....	46
Table 3-2b.	Light Smokers by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	47-48
Table 3-3a.	LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One or More Days in the Last Year by Demographic Groups .....	49-50
Table 3-3b.	LGBT Smokers Who made a Quit Attempt of One or More Days in the Last Year by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	51-52
Table 3-4a.	LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One Week or More in the Last Year by Demographic Groups .....	52-53
Table 3-4b.	LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt One Week or More in the Last Year by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	54-55

Table 3-5a.	LGBT Smokers Who Had a Quit Attempt of One Year or Longer in the Last Year Since Smoking Regularly by Demographic Groups .....	55-56
Table 3-5b.	LGBT Smokers in the Last Year Who Had Quit Attempts of One Year or Longer by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	57-58
Table 3-6.	Both Workplace and Home Smoking Restrictions by Smoking Status .....	58
Table 3-7a.	LGBT Smokers Who Quit Smoking for One Day or Longer in Past Year Who Used Cessation Aids for Most Recent Quit Attempt .....	60
Table 3-7b.	LGBT Smokers Who Quit Smoking for One Day or Longer in Past Year Who Used Cessation Aids for Most Recent Quit Attempt by Subpopulation .....	61
Table 3-7c.	LGBT Smokers Who Attempted to Quit in Last 12 Months Who Used Nicotine Replacement Therapy for Most Recent Quit Attempt by Demographic Groups .....	62-63
Table 3-7d.	Former Smokers Who Quit for 12 Months or More Using Nicotine Replacement Therapy .....	63
Table 3-8a.	LGBT Smokers Advised by Physician or Health Professional to Quit .....	63
Table 3-8b.	LGBT Smokers Advised by Physician or Health Professional to Quit by Subpopulation and Smoking Status .....	64
Table 3-9a.	Agreement that "Nonsmokers are more attractive to you than smokers" .....	64
Table 3-9b.	Agreement that "Nonsmokers are more attractive to you than smokers" by Subpopulation .....	65
Table 3-10a.	Agreement that "Someone who quits smoking will probably gain weight" .....	65
Table 3-10b.	Agreement that "Someone who quits smoking will probably gain weight" by Subpopulation .....	65
Table 3-11a.	LGBT Smokers Who Seem Less Likely To Quit by Consumption Level .....	66
Table 3-11b.	LGBT Smokers Who Seem Less Likely To Quit by Consumption Level and Subpopulation .....	66
Table 3-12a.	Former LGBT Smokers Estimation of Likelihood of Smoking Again .....	67
Table 3-12b.	Former LGBT Smokers Estimation of Likelihood of Smoking Again by Subpopulation .....	67
Table 3-13.	Comparison of 2003 California LGBT Survey Data on Smoking Cessation with Data from Other LGBT Published Studies .....	68
Table 4-1a.	Indoor LGBT Workers Reporting Smoke-free Workplace .....	69-70
Table 4-1b.	LGBT Workers Reporting Smoke-free Workplace by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	70-71
Table 4-2.	Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the Past Two Weeks by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	72-73
Table 4-3.	Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the Past Two Weeks by Smoking Status by LGBT Subpopulation .....	74
Table 4-4a.	Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the Past Two Weeks by Type of Workplace .....	74
Table 4-4b.	Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the Past Two Weeks by Type of Workplace by LGBT Subpopulation .....	75
Table 4-5a.	LGBT Homes that Report Total Bans on Smoking by Demographic Groups .....	76
Table 4-5b.	LGBT Homes that Report Total Bans on Smoking by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups .....	77-78
Table 4-6.	LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Smoking Status .....	78
Table 4-7.	LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Presence of a Child .....	79
Table 4-8.	Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in Places Other Than Home and Work by Smoking Status .....	79
Table 4-9.	Length of Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in All Locations Last Week by Smoking Status .....	80
Table 4-10.	Agreement that "Inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette causes lung cancer in a nonsmoker" .....	80



Table 4-11.	Agreement that “Inhaling smoke from someone else’s cigarette harms the health of babies and children” .....	80
Table 4-12.	Among LGBT Smokers: Agreement that “I rarely smoke when I am the only smoker in the group” .....	81
Table 4-13.	LGBT Nonsmoker Annoyance with Smoking .....	81
Table 4-14.	Asked Someone Not to Smoke in Last 12 Months.....	82
Table 4-15.	Of Those Who Asked Someone Not to Smoke, Who Respondent Asked and Why (Most Recent Occasion).....	82
Table 4-16.	How Often LGBT Smokers Were Asked to Not Smoke in the Past 12 Months .....	83
Table 5-1a.	Recall of Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines .....	84
Table 5-1b.	Recall of Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines by Smoking Status .....	84
Table 5-2a.	Most Recently Advertised Brand: Among Those Ever Recalling Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines .....	85
Table 5-2b.	Most Recently Advertised Brand: Among Those Ever Recalling Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines by Smoking Status.....	86
Table 5-3a.	Belief That Advertisements Were Specifically Designed to Appeal to LGBT People: Among Those Recalling Magazine Advertisements.....	86
Table 5-3b.	Belief That Advertisements Were Specifically Designed to Appeal to LGBT People: Among Those Recalling Magazine Advertisements by Smoking Status.....	87
Table 5-4a.	Receipt of Free Sample of Tobacco Products .....	87
Table 5-4b.	Receipt of Free Sample of Tobacco Products by Smoking Status .....	87
Table 5-4c.	Those Who Received a Free Sample of Tobacco Products by Age and Smoking Status .....	88
Table 5-5a.	Who Obtained Promotional Items With a Brand Name or Logo on it and How They Obtained it ....	88
Table 5-5b.	Who Obtained Promotional Items With a Brand Name or Logo on it and How They Obtained it by Smoking Status.....	89
Table 5-5c.	Those who Obtained Promotional Items With a Brand Name or Logo on it by Age and Smoking Status.....	89
Table 5-6a.	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Company Advertising and Promotions .....	90
Table 5-6b.	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Company Advertising and Promotions by Smoking Status .....	91
Table 6-1a.	Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days: Among Entire Sample .....	91
Table 6-1b.	Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days by Gender and Demographic Group .....	92-93
Table 6-1c.	Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days: Among Entire Sample by Smoking Status ....	93
Table 6-1d.	Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days by Age Group.....	94
Table 6-2a.	Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Types of Medium Where Messages Were Seen .....	94
Table 6-2b.	Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Types of Medium Where Messages Were Seen by Smoking Status .....	94
Table 6-3a.	Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Appeal of These Messages .....	95
Table 6-3b.	Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Appeal of These Messages by Smoking Status..	95
Table 6-4a.	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation .....	95
Table 6-4b.	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation by Smoking Status.....	96
Table 6-5a.	Amount of Additional Cigarette Taxes to Fund Children’s Health Programs.....	96
Table 6-5b.	Amount of Additional Cigarette Taxes to Fund Children’s Health Programs by Smoking Status .....	97
Table 6-6a.	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control Efforts in the LGBT Community .....	97
Table 6-6b.	Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control Efforts in the LGBT Community by Smoking Status.....	98

# Chapter 1 Executive Summary

In 2003-04, Field Research Corporation conducted a statewide household survey of the California lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) population for the Tobacco Control Section (TCS), Department of Health Services (DHS). The purpose was to assess tobacco-related behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge within the LGBT population; identify disparities between the LGBT and general adult populations of the State; and explore possible explanations for the most important differences.

A disproportionate, stratified random digit dial (RDD) sampling approach was used, one that over-sampled lesbian/gay enclaves and under-sampled other parts of the state. The interviews, which were conducted by telephone and averaged 31 minutes in length, were conducted in English and Spanish. Approximately 1200 interviews were conducted with men and 1100 with women.

This report presents initial findings on the surveillance and evaluation issues of greatest concern to TCS. In it, we compare data from the LGBT population with data from the general adult population of the state. For comparisons with the general adult population, we have relied on published data from the 2002 California Tobacco Survey (CTS), a general population survey conducted by TCS triennially.

## 1 Major Findings

### 1.1 Tobacco Use and Cessation

#### Smoking Prevalence<sup>1</sup>

Smoking prevalence for the LGBT population (30.4%) is about double that of the general population (15.4%) as reported by the 2002 CTS. The difference is most pronounced among women where LGBT women smoke at a rate of 32.5% compared to CTS rate of 11.9% for adult women generally. The LGBT woman's rate is almost 200% higher than CTS woman's rate. The LGBT men's rate is about 50% higher than that for CTS men (27.4% versus (vs.) 19.1%).

#### Use of Alternative Tobacco Products

Six percent of LGBT respondents reported use of cigars, chewing tobacco, or snuff at some point in their lives. The rate is higher for LGBT men (9.3%) than it is for LGBT women (3.7%). Cigars constitute the largest share of this alternative tobacco use. Among adult men generally, 7.1% reported current cigar use. Among adult women generally, the percentage was 1%. Among LGBT adults, 3.7% of males and 1.4% of females reported current cigar use.

#### Lapses and Relapses

In addition to the high prevalence of smoking, study data suggest that a sizeable number of non-daily and former smokers may be at risk for relapse. For 27.3% of non daily and former smokers, it has been less than a year since they smoked on a daily basis, a relatively short period of time. In addition, 7.4% of former smokers reported that they have smoked one or more cigarettes in the last 30 days and 20.8% report having taken a puff in the last year.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this report current smokers are those who have smoked at least 100 cigarettes and report currently smoking. Among current smokers there are daily smokers who "smoke every day" and non daily smokers who "smoke some days." Former smokers have smoked 100 or more cigarettes in their life but report they do not smoke now, even on some days. Never-smokers are those who say they have not smoked 100 cigarettes.

## Cigarette Consumption Levels<sup>2</sup>

About 70% of LGBT smokers are light smokers (<15/day), smokers who may be less addicted and more able to quit. That number is split between light non-daily smokers (about 40%) and light daily smokers (about 60%). Moderate smokers (15-24/day) constitute about a quarter of current LGBT smokers. Only 7% are heavy smokers (25 plus/day). As with women generally, LGBT women are a little more likely than LGBT men to be light smokers (73.2% vs. 64.9%).

LGBT smokers are somewhat more likely to be light smokers than California smokers generally: 70.2% compared with 61.5%. The two populations are also nearly identical in the proportion of non-daily smokers, about one-quarter.

## Quit Attempts

Smoking research has shown that those with more quitting history are more likely to finally succeed. Quitting behaviors may also be viewed as measures of the effectiveness of smoking cessation efforts.

About three out of five LGBT smokers (62.7%) reported a quit attempt lasting one or more days within the last year; two out of five (39.1%) reported an attempt lasting one week or more; and one in five reported one lasting a year or longer (22.0%). In general, LGBT women were more likely than LGBT men to report quit attempts. Women were also more likely than men to report quit attempts of longer duration.

The percentage of smokers making quit attempts of a day or longer is remarkably similar between the LGBT and general populations (62.7% and 62.1%). The percentage making an attempt of a week or longer is also very similar (39.1% and 40.5%). The same is true of the percentage of smokers making an attempt of one year or longer (22% in both populations.)

## Cessation Support from Smoking Restrictions

Spending time in places with explicit policies restricting smoking has been associated with greater success in quitting. Overall, about 40% of all LGBT adults both work and live in places where such policies are in place. The percentage drops into the mid-20% range when considering smokers only, a drop due to the many LGBT smokers who do not totally restrict smoking at home.

There is no comparable published 2002 CTS data on the total percentage of all adults both living and working in restricted environments. There is, however, data on smokers and it suggests that there are no real differences between the LGBT and general adult populations; in both, it is about 25%.

## Use of Cessation Aids

Nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) is the cessation aid most commonly used by LGBT men and women in their most recent quit attempt. One in four of these quitters used NRT (25%). It was most popular among moderate and heavy smokers. Use of NRT by LGBT smokers who attempted to quit in the last 12 months appears to be greater than within the general population (25% vs. 15.7%). This difference is persistent across many of the demographic groups in both populations.

Fewer LGBT smokers visiting health professionals in the last year were advised to quit. In the general adult population 57.2% were advised to quit compared to 44.5% in the LGBT population. In both populations, women were more likely than men to report being advised to quit.

There seems to be only limited interest in cessation programs custom tailored for LGBT smokers: only about 5% said they would want such a program if they were to seek outside help. As might be expected, more gay/bisexual identifying men and lesbian/bisexual identifying women were interested in tailored programs than those who did not self-identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter 5, Section 2-3, for definitions of consumption levels

## Identifying Those Unlikely to Quit

The 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey assessed the number of people who are not likely to quit based on either behavior (no quit attempt for one or more days in the last year) or attitude (disagreement with a statement that they would like to stop smoking). Presently, approximately 40% of current LGBT smokers fit this definition. Those who are more likely to quit tend to be light, non-daily smokers. Heavy smokers are less likely to quit: 60.9% have not attempted to quit and do not want to stop smoking. Of greatest concern are LGBT women who smoke heavily: more than 70% are unlikely to quit.

The similar trend was reported in the 2002 CTS.

## 1.2 Secondhand Smoke Exposure

### Workplace Restrictions and Smoke Exposure

As with California adults generally, almost all LGBT respondents (96.6%) reported that they work in a setting with a smoke-free policy. Despite these smoke-free policies, however, 12.5% of LGBT adults reported some exposure to secondhand smoke (SHS) in the workplace. In general, more LGBT women reported exposure than men including about one out of five Hispanics (21%) and those of other non-white race/ethnicities (22.3%). While rates of exposure were higher in general for those with household incomes under \$30,000, rates of exposure for LGBT women in these lower income categories ranged from 26.7% to 32.5%.

These LGBT data are similar to those for the general population with two exceptions: LGBT adults with less than a high school degree (35.7%) are more likely to be exposed than their counterparts in the general population (16.1%). The same is true of those with household annual incomes under \$30,000. In the 2003 LGBT Tobacco Survey, 20.5% to 29.4% of respondents in the lower income categories reported exposure as compared to 12.2% to 19.8% for CTS respondents in the comparable categories.

### Home Exposure

About seven out of ten LGBT respondents (67.9%) reported that smoking is completely prohibited in their households. This is a lower rate than in the general population where 76.9% reported that smoking is completely prohibited. This ten percent difference holds across all the demographic groups with two exceptions-far fewer LGBT respondents with lower incomes and lower levels of education report bans than their general population counterparts.

When considering just the households of smokers, the portion of LGBT households with complete smoking bans is about equal to that of the general population (47.2% compared to 49%). The two groups are also approximately the same in terms of the portion of households with no restrictions on smoking (26% and 23.7%).

Smoking in homes with children is particularly problematic due to the deleterious effects of SHS on the health of children. Among LGBT households where there is at least one smoker and a child present, 63.1% have total smoking bans. This is much higher than the rate for LGBT smokers without children and approaches the rate for LGBT households generally. Nevertheless, it places a significant number of children at some risk of adverse health consequences.

### Exposure in Other Settings/Total Exposure

Almost two out of five LGBT respondents (39.6%) reported that they are often exposed to SHS near building entrances, in cars, or places other than work or home. LGBT smokers are more likely (45.7%) than nonsmokers (36.8%) to report exposure in these other settings. No comparable 2002 CTS data are available from published sources.

Among nonsmokers, more than one in ten (14.2%) were exposed to SHS for an hour or longer in the preceding week. As with the data on exposure in other settings, no comparable 2002 CTS data is available from published sources on the issue of total exposure.

## **1.3 Tobacco Advertising and Promotion**

### **Recall and Appeal of Cigarette Advertising**

More than 90% of LGBT respondents recalled seeing cigarette advertisements (ads) in magazines. The brands most often remembered were Marlboro, Camel, and Virginia Slims. Few (16.3%) believed that the recalled ads were especially designed to appeal to LGBT people.

### **Receipt of Free Tobacco Products and Branded Promotional Items**

Almost 7% of LGBT adults, regardless of smoking status, reported receipt of free samples of tobacco products. Smokers were more likely to report receipt of the samples than nonsmokers. Among gay/bisexual identifying male smokers, 11.6% reported receipt of the samples; among lesbian/bisexual identifying female smokers, 12% reported receipt of the samples.

In terms of branded promotional items, 5.8% of LGBT adults reported that they either bought or received one for free. This is roughly comparable to CTS data. Although the difference is small, LGBT women were more likely than men to report receipt of the promotional items.

### **Attitudes Toward Industry Marketing Issues**

A large majority of the LGBT population (70.1%) appears to support extending the current restriction on cigarette advertising to all media. An even larger majority (78.3%) agrees that tobacco advertising encourages young people to smoke. A smaller majority (52.7%) agrees that LGBT organizations should not accept money from tobacco companies.

The level of awareness about tobacco industry (TI) targeting of the LGBT population is quite low. Only 32.1% of respondents knew that the tobacco companies target LGBT people in their marketing efforts.

## **1.4 Exposure to Anti-Tobacco Messages**

### **Recall and Appeal of Anti-tobacco Messages**

The rate of recall of anti-tobacco messages is quite high, roughly comparable to that for the general adult population of the State. About three-quarters (73.6%) of the LGBT respondents recalled seeing or hearing an anti-tobacco message in the last 30 days.

Many of the LGBT study respondents said that they did not find the anti-tobacco ads especially appealing. In terms of personal appeal, only 44.3% found the messages appealing. In terms of appeal for LGBT people in general, the percentage was even lower, 17.5%.

### **Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation**

There is overwhelming agreement (83.5%) within the California LGBT population that tobacco companies could lower the nicotine content of tobacco products if they wanted to. About six in ten (59.6%) also agree that tobacco products should be regulated by a government agency such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Support is lower (24.6%), however, for banning the production and sale of cigarettes in the United States (U.S.)

There is broad support (79.3%) for an increased tax on cigarettes in California. About one-third (31.4%) of LGBT adults favor the largest tax increase we tested, a \$2 per pack increase. A majority (52.5%) supports a tax increase of at least \$1.

### **Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control in the LGBT Community**

Most LGBT people do not perceive that smoking is a bigger health problem for them than for people in general. On another important tobacco control issue, more than one third (37%) believe that anti-smoking campaigns ignore the LGBT community.

## Chapter 2 Background/Objectives

Smoking is the leading preventable cause of death in the US and has been for some time. Each year it is estimated that more than 40,000 Californians die prematurely because of cigarette smoking (DHS, TCS 2000). In addition, billions of dollars are spent every year treating Californians suffering from smoking-related illnesses.

In 1964 a report by the U.S. Surgeon General initiated a concerted national effort to combat smoking and smoking-related health problems. In the 1960's and 1970's California and most other states initiated programs encouraging smokers to quit smoking, discouraging smoking initiation, and protecting nonsmokers from SHS. These programs resulted in a number of successes. In 1988, California voters passed Proposition 99, a measure significantly increasing tobacco excise tax rates and establishing a new California Tobacco Control Program, the largest of its kind in the world.

A hallmark of the California Tobacco Control Program has been its primary focus on population-based rather than individual-level behavior change approaches. Consistent with this emphasis, it has established multi-sector partnerships and worked to mobilize the entire community on behalf of tobacco control objectives. It has also implemented well-funded media campaigns, enacted SHS protections, and succeeded in limiting TI marketing efforts and youth access to tobacco products.

The California Tobacco Control Program has also relied upon comprehensive surveillance and evaluation systems to guide program development. For example, over the last decade and a half, the DHS' TCS, which administers the California Tobacco Control Program, has sponsored large-scale surveys of the California population in order to assess recall of tobacco control messages, exposure to TI marketing efforts, and related behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge. These studies have documented impressive program successes. There have been decreases in smoking prevalence and cigarette consumption rates in California as well as increases in quitting activity and the number of smoke-free workplaces (Gilpin, 2004).

One important California Tobacco Control Program target audience, the LGBT population, has been under-studied in these surveillance and evaluation studies. This is despite research suggesting higher than average smoking rates and intensive TI marketing attention (Gruskin, 2001; Stall and Greenwood 1999; Lippman, 1992). In order to remedy this lack of data, TCS issued a request for proposals (RFP) in early 2002 to conduct a survey of the California adult LGBT population. It stipulated that the survey needed to be statewide and large enough to ensure precise statewide estimates of smoking prevalence for both LGBT males and females. Field Research Corporation submitted a proposal in response to the RFP and was awarded a contract to conduct the study. Work on its design began in September 2002. The specific objectives of the project were to:

- Assess tobacco-use behaviors including the prevalence of smoking and use of alternative tobacco products, cigarette consumption levels, and brand preferences;
- Assess cessation-related behaviors and intentions, including quitting history and smoking relapse;
- Test possible relationships between tobacco-related behaviors and LGBT relevant behavioral determinants such as violence/discrimination, internalized homophobia, depression, substance use, Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection, and other life stressors;
- Determine attitudes toward SHS, levels of exposure, and how often nonsmokers assert their rights when smokers light up;
- Profile attitudes toward important current tobacco control issues as well as the extent of exposure to California Tobacco Control Program messages;
- Profile attitudes toward TI marketing efforts and proposals to regulate them, as well as the extent of exposure to TI marketing campaigns; and,
- On important tobacco control indicators, compare data from the LGBT population to that of California general adult population as assessed in the 2002 CTS conducted by TCS.

In the process of conducting the study it was also hoped that basic data on the demographic composition of the California LGBT population could be collected, data urgently needed for program planning and development efforts. As a result, this became an additional project objective.

This report presents preliminary data from the study: frequency distributions on the main tobacco control indicators as well as comparisons with data for the California adult population. More detailed analyses will follow.

# Chapter 3 Methodology

This chapter of the report briefly describes the study methodology. For more detailed information see the separate full report on LGBT Tobacco Survey methods.

## 1 Overview

The study entailed 2,287 telephone interviews<sup>3</sup> with a RDD sample of the California LGBT household population. In total, 1,192 interviews were with men and 1,095 with women. The interviews were conducted between July 2003 and March 2004 from the San Diego and San Francisco telephone research centers of Field Research Corporation. Interviews, which lasted on average 31 minutes, were conducted in English and Spanish.

We used a disproportionate stratified RDD design in order to maximize sampling efficiency and reduce costs. Based on data on the geographical distribution of same gender-domestic-partnerships from the 2000 U.S. Census, and other information, we assigned all California phone exchanges to one of six strata based on estimates we constructed of the number and incidence of LGBT households. An LGBT household was defined as a household in which one or more LGBT adults resided. Our approach was to over-sample the high-density strata and under-sample the less dense ones. Upon completion the data set was weighted to reflect the unequal probabilities of selection within the respective sampling strata.

## 2 Definition of Study Population

### 2.1 Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals

There is no single way to precisely define the LGBT population. Some researchers and advocates define it in terms of self-identified sexual orientation. Following this approach, a lesbian (or gay) person is someone who labels herself (or himself) as such. It is also possible to define the population in terms of sexual behavior rather than orientation. Following this approach, a lesbian, gay, or bisexual is someone who engages in sexual activity with a partner of the same gender. This second approach is useful since previous research has demonstrated that not all those who self-identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual actually have sex with someone of the same gender. Conversely we know that not everyone who has sex with others of the same gender self-identifies as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (Lauman et al., 1994). In addition to these two approaches, there is a third one that relies on sexual attraction or desire. Following this definition, a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person is someone who is attracted (exclusively or only in part) to people of the same gender. Some of these individuals may never engage in same gender sex and may or may not identify themselves as gay, lesbian, or bisexual.

Depending on which definition is selected, surveys suggest that 1-8% of adults can be categorized as gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Lauman et al., 1994). Typically, the use of the self-identification approach yields something in the 1-3% range in most household surveys. A definition based on sexual behavior during the last year, in addition to self identification, yields a slightly larger group. A definition based on sexual behavior since adulthood yields a bigger group, usually in the 4-5% range. One based on sexual behavior in one's lifetime, or since puberty, yields a larger group, usually in the 4-7% range. Those based on desire, or attraction, usually yield the largest estimates, approximately 8%. The proportions range from study to study not only because of different definitions but because of different survey question wording as well. Interestingly, under any of these definitions, earlier studies usually found more males than females. That is not the case with the present study, as this report makes clear.

---

<sup>3</sup> This includes 2,152 completed interviews and 135 partial interviews.



We adopted the most inclusive definition possible since so little data existed on the population as well as its tobacco-related behaviors and attitudes. We wanted to include all segments of the population so that differences could be identified. In addition, one hypothesis is that LGBT persons who do not self-identify smoke at a higher rate and may be most under-served by smoking cessation and other programs, so we wanted to be able to look at these issues. In the end, we defined gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals in terms of both self-identification and sexual behavior. For behavior, we settled on same gender partners at any time in life with the hope that it would make more closeted individuals willing to self-disclose and participate in the study. Clearly, while the stigma against homosexuality has greatly lessened it still exists and, hence, all surveys seeking to identify LGBT people must be regarded as excluding at least some individuals who are reluctant to disclose their behavior or identity to a stranger over the telephone. Although we considered also including the desire criterion, in the end we did not because of the challenges of screening for it in an RDD sample.

## 2.2 Transgender Persons

Many advocacy groups working to address transgender concerns define transgender very broadly to include anyone who is gender ambiguous in any way. A more narrow definition would include only inter-sexed individuals (people who are biologically both male and female) and individuals who actually identify with a gender other than the one they were born with. In the end, we defined transgender persons as those who identify as transgender or transsexual in any way, including anyone with a gender identity or presentation that is different from what society dictates based on sex at birth.

## 3 Household Screening Questions

In terms of actual screening questions, the wording was as follows:<sup>4</sup>

*“For these interviews we are interested in speaking with people who are not often studied in public health research: women who have sex with other women. By this I mean, adult women who have had sex of any kind with a woman at some time in their life (if necessary; since the age of 14) as well as women who identify as lesbian or bisexual. Would you include yourself in one of these groups?”*

If the informant answered no, the following question was asked:

*“Regardless of whether a person thinks of herself as lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual, we are interested in speaking with adult women who may only occasionally have sex with other women. Do you fall into this category?”*

If the informant answered no again, the following, third question was posed:

*“We are also interested in speaking with adults who consider themselves to be transgender, or transsexual in any way. By this, I mean people who have a gender identity or presentation that is different from what society says you should have for your birth sex. Would you include yourself in this group?”*

An affirmative answer to any one the questions meant that the informant was eligible to be interviewed.

## 4 Random Digit Dial Sample Design

---

<sup>4</sup> The screening items presented here are an excerpt from that section of the screener devoted to the identification of female eligibles in the household. The language related to males was identical except that the gender references were changed.

## 4.1 Sample Design and Development

The LGBT Tobacco Survey employed a disproportionate stratified design to maximize efficiency and reduce the costs of collecting a representative sample among this low incidence population. The design of the stratification plan and the allocation of sample to strata required extensive study and modeling as very little was known about the size or the distribution of the LGBT population in California. Previous LGBT-focused surveys were with patient populations, convenience samples, or implemented only within areas of high LGBT concentration (e.g., the Castro neighborhood in San Francisco and West Hollywood). Even in those neighborhoods, most studies focused solely on gay and bisexual men. What few population-based surveys there were had been conducted on a nationwide basis and provide scant information about the distribution of the LGBT population of California. Even California statewide surveys such as the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) had limited samples on which to base any observations about the distribution of LGBT households or the size of the population. The difficulties were compounded by the fact that different questions were asked to identify the LGBT population making findings somewhat incomparable.

Nonetheless, it was these studies in combination with the 2000 US Census data on same-gender domestic partnerships that formed the basis of the LGBT sample design. For women, for whom the least was known, US Census data on the distribution of never-married women over the age of 35 were also reviewed as was information on the distribution of lesbian/bisexual women on several large mailing lists.

Additional detail about the survey methodology is provided in a separate methodology report submitted to the TCS. Briefly, based on other studies two highest density strata were identified which fell in the following areas of California: the Arcata/Eureka area in Northern California; Oakland and Berkeley; the Palm Springs area in Riverside County; portions of Sonoma County; West Los Angeles; and parts of the cities of Sacramento, San Diego, and San Francisco. To form the other strata, and account for the other areas containing about 95% of the state's households, the ZIP Codes for the state were arrayed in order of the incidence of same-sex partners (combined male and female rates) as reported by the 2000 Census. The ZIP Codes naturally clustered in four ranges of declining incidence.

A summary of the characteristics of the six strata is provided in Table A.

<b>Table A.</b> <b>Characteristics of Strata</b>			
<b>Stratum</b>	<b>Estimated Number of CA - Household in Stratum</b>	<b>Percentage of CA - Household in Stratum</b>	<b>Range of Rates of Same - Gender Couples in ZIP Codes Assigned to Stratum</b>
1	152,511	1.2%	NA
2	399,865	3.2%	NA
3	585,635	4.7%	1.3% to 2.6%
4	2,001,225	16.0%	0.8% to 1.3%
5	6,842,908	54.8%	0.5% to 0.8%
6	2,507,909	20.1%	0.0% to 0.5%
Total	12,490,053		

The next step in the design of the sampling plan was to set targets for completed interviews in each stratum that would result in the lowest possible sampling error on our estimates of smoking prevalence for men and women (separately) after taking the expected design effect into consideration. We again looked to the sources mentioned above as an aid in estimating the population sizes by stratum. Estimates of the populations of LGBT men and women were formed resulting in the distribution of the population as reported in Table B below. Table B also reports the distribution we found when conducting the LGBT Tobacco Survey. Initial estimates were reasonably close to the actual rates experienced in the survey although the men were concentrated in high density enclaves to an even greater degree than expected and the women were concentrated in these areas to a lesser degree than expected.

Table B. Comparison of Estimated and Actual Distribution of LGBT Men and Women in California				
Stratum	LGBT Men		LGBT Women	
	Estimated Distribution	Found Distribution	Estimated Distribution	Found Distribution
1	2.8%	9.1%	2.1%	2.7%
2	6.1%	8.1%	4.8%	5.5%
3	6.7%	10.1%	5.5%	6.1%
4	19.2%	15.0%	17.7%	14.4%
5	51.7%	47.0%	52.6%	54.1%
6	13.5%	10.7%	8.6%	17.2%

After the incidence estimation work was completed for the strata defined in terms of ZIP codes, we worked with Marketing Systems Group, our sampling vendor, to link telephone exchanges to ZIP Codes and draw an RDD sample. Planning a sample design and allocating sample to strata in a way that is highly efficient requires not only knowledge of the population distribution and size but also of the costs associated with completing an interview in each of the strata. These costs would only be revealed through actual experience doing interviews so the survey began without fixed sample allocations and we simply released equal amounts of sample to each stratum and observed closely the incidence rates of LGBT households, the cost to complete interviews in each stratum, and the smoking prevalence for men and women in each stratum. These figures were then used to produce a rough approximation of the design effect and, in turn, the sampling error around the measure of smoking prevalence. The sample allocation to stratum was optimized to produce the greatest precision given available resources. Estimates of the survey-data-based parameters of the optimization algorithm were updated at several points throughout the survey to achieve the greatest possible efficiency in the design. At the end of the project, a total of nearly 200,000 numbers had been dialed.

## 4.2 Sample Selection

The general approach employed to identify respondents was a two-stage sampling procedure in which approximately 32,000 households were screened to learn from a screener respondent if any of the household members were eligible to participate in the survey. That is, after introducing the study, we asked the persons to whom we were speaking if they considered themselves to be gay/lesbian (depending on the gender of the screener respondent) or bisexual. If they did not, we said we were interested in interviewing people who had ever had same-gender sex and whether they considered themselves to be in that group. Regardless of the screener respondent's answers to these questions, we continued to ask the same questions about the other members of the household, if there were any. If no one was eligible, we obtained the respondents' ZIP Code and thanked them for their time. If one or more persons were identified as eligible we randomly selected<sup>5</sup> one LGBT person and administered a series of screener questions to confirm their eligibility.<sup>6</sup> The selection of a respondent was made without regard to gender so that the incidence of males and females in the final sample reflects their incidence in the population.

In this fashion about 3,000 households were found to have one or more LGBT persons who confirmed their eligibility. Of that number, 2,287 LGBT persons provided information on their smoking status and a total of 2,152 completed the interview. Another 346 out of the 3,000 were determined to be over quota and, while there was an LGBT person in the household willing to participate, they were not asked to complete an interview.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> We used the "most recent birthday" method to randomly select a respondent when there were multiple eligible household members. This technique has proven to be effective in simulating a true random selection and in some ways may be superior to the traditional method of household enumeration and random selection because there are fewer refusals during screening.

<sup>6</sup> If the screened person did not confirm that he/she was LGBT, and there was a second person thought to be LGBT, we attempted to screen the second person.

<sup>7</sup> We reached our targeted number of LGBT men before we reached our target for women. Between that point and the end of the survey, we screened 362 households that had one or more LGBT men but no LGBT women. The male-only households were considered over quota.

## 5 Questionnaire Development

Project staff worked closely with TCS on the development of the survey questionnaire. The objective was to design a survey that would provide smoking behavior data comparable to those developed by CTS and to collect information that would help explain the behavioral patterns within this special population. The interview was designed to take 30 minutes on average to complete. The main topics in the interview were:

- Tobacco use history (e.g., current smoking status, past smoking behavior, brand preference, consumption levels, and alternative tobacco use);
- Smoking cessation (e.g., history of quit attempts, use of cessation tools such as nicotine substitutes; preference for custom-tailored cessation programs; intention to quit; and, likelihood of relapse);
- SHS exposure (in the workplace, at home, other places, and among partners and friends);
- Exposure to cigarette ads and promotional efforts;
- Attitudes of nonsmokers toward smokers and assertion of nonsmokers rights;
- Exposure to anti-tobacco messages in LGBT magazines/newspapers as well as the general media;
- Knowledge and attitudes about the dangers of smoking, tobacco advertising and promotion, government and taxes, and the California Tobacco Control Program;
- Gender of sex partners, self-identified sexual orientation, sexual attraction, disclosure, and community affiliation;
- Socio-demographics (e.g., age, gender, education, income).

Almost all of the smoking-related questions were taken from CTS to facilitate the comparison of the LGBT data with those from the California general population. Other questions taken from CTS include the items on smoking cessation and exposure to SHS, TI marketing efforts, and the California Tobacco Control Program. In addition, a number of tobacco control related knowledge and attitudinal items were either borrowed from CTS or adapted from it. Many of the socio-demographic questions were also taken from CTS.

Items on smoking cessation intervention preferences were adapted from Stall, Greenwood, and Paul's Urban Men's Health Study (UMHS) as were some of the smoking attitudinal, same-gender attraction, sexual behavior, and disclosure questions (Stall, 2001). In addition, the discrimination, violence, and HIV/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) questions were adapted from UMHS. Items assessing LGBT community affiliation were adapted from Meyer's study of LGBT community involvement and discrimination (Meyer, 2003). Questions on internalized homophobia were adapted from Kegeles' Young Men's Survey (Kegeles, 1996). The perceived stress scale was based on Cohen's work in this area. (Cohen, 1983). For depression, we used Radloff's Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D) (Radloff, 1977). The alcohol use questions were taken from Weisner's alcohol treatment study (Weisner, 1993).

Screening questions were adapted from the previous work of Catania, et. al. at University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) (Catania, 2001). The general approach and some of the specific items were used on a number of previous surveys of men who having sex with men (MSM).

Once a complete questionnaire was assembled, we asked a number of LGBT tobacco control advocates, interventionists, and researchers to review the instrument. Following this review and subsequent changes, it was sent to TCS for approval.

After the instrument was finalized and approved, it was programmed onto Field Research Corporation's computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system, using Quancept, a powerful CATI programming system supported by SPSS. Two pretests followed. Based on these pretests, a number of reductions and other changes were made and it was adapted for use in Spanish. Final programming and quality checks then followed prior to commencing interviewing.

## 6 Interviewer Selection, Training, and Supervision

All individuals were carefully screened prior to selection for the project team. Individuals selected for the team were skilled, experienced CATI interviewers at Field Research Corporation. Most had experience with complex screening, sensitive-topic

studies, and research within difficult to-reach populations. Others were recommended for the study because of their abilities and previous performance. Interviewers were not selected on the basis of gender or sexual orientation though they had to demonstrate their sensitivity to the subject matter and maintain a professional and neutral demeanor.

All interviewers participated in an eight-hour briefing session plus additional hours of role-playing and practice. The briefing session covered the following topics: study background and objectives; sample design overview; survey eligibility requirements; answers to frequently asked questions; methods for administering the screener and main body of the questionnaire; and techniques for increasing response and recording call outcomes. Training materials included a 17-page training guide in addition to hard copies of the survey instruments.

All telephone interviewers were regularly monitored throughout the data collection period. Monitoring was conducted by telephone interviewing monitors, supervisors, and data collection managers. Meetings among the supervisors and data collection managers were held regularly to discuss interviewer performance. Statistics on productivity, ability to screen households, and other dimensions of performance were reviewed on a regular basis, and interviewers whose performance was not as high as the study required were either retrained on specific instructions or techniques, or were removed from the study. Some telephone interviewers who did especially well on the study were selected for the refusal conversion team. This team was responsible for all follow up attempts to screen households and complete interviews.

## **7 Sample Administration Procedures**

### **7.1 Telephone Contact Protocol**

All initial contact attempts were made during the evening hours on weekdays and throughout the day on weekends to maximize the chances of screening households and conducting interviews with both working and non-working individuals. Interviewers recorded the result of each contact attempt in the CATI program (e.g., no answer, callback, completed interview, etc.) The CATI system reviewed all attempts and scheduled callbacks to optimize the chance of reaching a member of the household. Up to 25 attempts were made to each telephone number. Up to five attempts were made to reach a household and speak to someone. If we reached a person live, we made up to ten additional attempts to screen the household for an eligible LGBT. If we determined there was an eligible LGBT, an additional ten attempts were made to complete the interview.

Field Research Corporation conducted the interview with eligible respondents during the first call, if possible, or scheduled a callback for a more convenient time. At the conclusion of each call attempt the interviewer assigned the case a disposition code to reflect the call outcome and dictate the callback strategy. For example, if the disposition was a “hard refusal” (i.e., respondent told the interviewer not to call back), the case would be assigned an outcome code of “hard refusal” and the number would not be called again. If the respondent said it was a bad time, the interviewer assigned a disposition of “call back” and probed the respondent for a good time for the callback.

To minimize refusals and break-offs, interviewers were trained in refusal avoidance as well as refusal conversion techniques. Refusal conversion efforts involved making callbacks to all households and respondents who originally refused to see if they might reconsider and participate in the study. If the initial refusal was “hostile” or “hard,” a second call was not made. Additional calls were made to households that had “soft refusals” or had hung up on the interviewer before she was able to introduce the study.

A special refusal conversion effort was implemented for households where we had reason to believe there was one or more LGBT persons. For example, if the screener respondent said that another member of the household might be LGBT, we made additional efforts beyond the 25-call limit to reach that person, screen them for eligibility, and conduct an interview. These special efforts were implemented by a small group of the most capable interviewers. Each was given a specific group of numbers to call, and only one interviewer worked with each number. This case management approach proved to be very cost effective in terms of the additional completed interviews achieved. The screener cooperation rate was 89% and the extended interview cooperation rate was 88%.

## 7.2 Average Interview Length

Overall, the average interview length was 31.1 minutes. Total interviewer time per completed interview was about ten hours.

## 8 Sample Performance/Final Dispositions<sup>8</sup>

Slightly fewer than 200,000 numbers were placed in Field Research Corporation's Sample Management System and calls were attempted. Of those, just under 46,000 were found to be out-of scope non-households (e.g., fax/modem, disconnected numbers, business, etc.) and for just under 55,000 numbers no one ever answered the phone in five attempts. In just over 57,000 instances the phone was answered at least once but we could not determine if it was a household or if there was an eligible LGBT (e.g., language barrier, immediate hang-up or hard refusal, multiple soft refusals, unable to complete the screening after 15 attempts, etc.). Another 28,000 were ineligible in that there were no LGBT person(s) in the household.

Overall, about 32,000 households were fully screened out of a base of nearly 107,000 numbers determined to actually be households. This 107,000-number base includes all the known households we identified through our calling plus one-third of numbers where there never was an answer after five attempts, an adjustment often made by survey researchers because many of the never answered numbers are not in fact working residential telephone numbers. This resulted in a household screener completion rate of 29.2%. The extended interview completion rate among those deemed eligible for the survey was 89.9%. Therefore, the net response rate was 26.2% ( $29.2\% \times 89.9\%$ ).

Field Research Corporation calculated the LGBT response rates in a manner similar to CTS. Although the two studies had different protocols and resource levels, the final response rates are not dissimilar. The rates for CTS are 26.4% for young adults and 31.7% for adults age 30 and older compared to 26.2% for the LGBT Tobacco Survey. The components of the response rates were somewhat different between the two surveys. LGBT had a lower household screening rate but higher respondent cooperation.

The LGBT overall response rate is similar to those found on other large-scale RDD surveys Field Research Corporation has conducted, surveys involving household screening on sensitive topics and extensive informed consent requirements.

## 9 Sample Weighting/Preparation

Weights for the LGBT Tobacco Survey data were developed to compensate for unequal probabilities of inclusion in the sample. The process of developing the weights involved many steps due to the complex design and the lack of pre-existing information on the size and distribution of the LGBT population.

To begin, base weights were developed to reflect the probability of selecting a sample of a certain size from a population of a certain size by stratum. That is, if you sample 100 people out of a group of 1,000, the base weight is  $1,000/100$  or 10. Typically in population-based surveys there are good estimates of the population size in the surveyed area (or in the strata) to serve as the denominator for calculation. Because so little is known about the LGBT population, LGBT Tobacco Survey findings themselves were used to develop population size estimates for each stratum to use in the calculation of base weights for each of the survey's six strata.

Household weights consisted of two components, the first reflecting the total number of telephones in a household. A weighting factor of unity was assigned to households reporting one telephone number used in the household for making and receiving calls and a factor of one half was assigned to households reporting two or more such lines. The second household weight component was based on the total number of LGBT household members which was determined in the screener.

---

<sup>8</sup> The detailed Final Sample Disposition Report is included in the companion Survey Methodology report.

The three weight components (base and two household weights) were combined to create a single person-level weight for each survey respondent. The weights of the respondents were adjusted by scaling so that the sum of the adjusted weights was equal to the estimated population totals.

A special weight was included for Spanish speakers. At the mid-point of sample release it became apparent that very few Spanish speakers were eligible for the survey. To conserve resources, no further screening was conducted in Spanish in subsequently released replicates. The completed interviews with Spanish speakers were weighted up to adjust for this additional sampling phase.

## 10 Data Analysis Plan

The initial analytic emphasis has been to understand how the LGBT population compares with the California general adult population on the main tobacco control indicators. Basically, we have compared data from the 2002 CTS with data from our LGBT Tobacco Survey. Specifically, we have focused on comparing:

- The California general adult population with the LGBT population;
- The LGBT sample as a whole with LGBT men and LGBT women;
- LGBT-identified men and women with those who do not self-identify;
- Important demographic groups within the LGBT sample;
- Lesbians, gays, and bisexuals who are open about their sexual orientation with those who are more closeted; and
- LGBT community-affiliated individuals with those who are less affiliated.

In addition, on some issues, LGBT smokers are compared with nonsmokers and light smokers are compared with moderate and heavy smokers. Whenever possible we have configured our tobacco control variables exactly as they are configured in CTS.

Subsequent work will focus on a detailed analysis of the LGBT population and its demographic and sexual identity characteristics. In addition, we will explore current and lifetime tobacco use, cessation behaviors, and SHS exposure. In this latter work, we will compare key segments within the overall LGBT population and assess the relevance of behavioral predictors on the individual as well as social and environmental levels. Examples of individual predictors include internalized homophobia and alcohol as well as drug use. Social and environmental predictors include bar attendance, participation in LGBT community activities, and exposure to tobacco product promotions. This upcoming work, funded by the UC Tobacco Related Disease Research Program, will be completed in partnership with TCS.

## 11 Sampling Error

Measures of sampling error were calculated around five critical indicators of smoking behavior and exposure (smoking prevalence, consumption, home smoking bans, exposure in the workplace, and exposure in places other than work and home) for seven subgroups: total sample, LGBT men vs. LGBT women, and four subpopulations, gay/bisexual men, lesbian/bisexual women, other LGBT men, and other LGBT women. The confidence intervals around these proportions are reported in the tables in Chapter 5.

We used the formula for a stratified design with disproportionate allocation. The individual stratum variances were calculated using the weighted proportion for each of the six strata together with the un-weighted sample size for the corresponding stratum. Stratum variances were combined using the stratum weight  $W_h$ , the estimated proportion of the total population belonging to stratum  $h$ . The full table of measures of sampling error including the standard error, confidence interval, coefficient of variation, design effect and un-weighted number of cases are included in Appendix B.

As expected, the highest levels of precision are achieved for the total sample mostly because the sample size is the largest. Lower levels of precision are found for proportions based only within subgroups (e.g., smokers, indoor workers, men only). The design effect, which in this case is driven mainly by the allocation of sample to the six strata, varies greatly. That, in turn, affects precision levels.

In order to have a sense of the precision levels of the other proportions presented in the report we suggest that readers first focus on the confidence intervals reported in Appendix B to get a feeling for the levels of precision corresponding to different combinations of proportions and subgroups. Approximate confidence intervals around proportions for other subgroups can be extrapolated using the coefficient of variation and the design effects. Since the sample was drawn as a RDD sample, there is no clustering (in a formal sense) and therefore no intra-class correlation.

It is important to remember that there are sources of error other than sampling variability. These include errors arising from biases in the patterns of response and non-response, inaccuracies in reporting by respondents, differences between interviewers, and errors in the recording and coding of data. Field Research used procedures to detect and minimize these types of errors but they still may occur. Unfortunately, non-sampling error cannot be easily quantified.

## **12 Final Data Base and Deliverables**

The following deliverables were prepared for the LGBT Tobacco Survey:

- This main report presenting major findings concerning smoking prevalence, consumption, cessation, and exposure to SHS;
- A Survey Methodology report that provides greater detail on the topics covered in this chapter and includes tables of basic, un-weighted frequencies detailing responses to each survey question.

## **13 Study Team**

The study team was led by project director, Mr. Larry Bye, Senior Research Director/Vice President, Field Research Corporation, and co-principal investigators, Dr. Elizabeth Gruskin of the Kaiser Permanente Division of Research, and Dr. Greg Greenwood of UCSF.

Other team members included: Ms. Victoria Albright, Research Director/Vice President, Field Research Corporation, who assisted Mr. Bye with day-to-day management of the project as well as sample design, sample and data analysis, and report writing responsibilities; Dr. Karol Krotki, a consultant to Field Research Corporation, who served as project statistician; Ms. Roxanne Metz, Field Director at Field Research Corporation, who helped plan the project and oversaw data collection activity; Ms. Sarah Barry and Dr. Jeff Diamond, Survey Supervisors at Field Research Corporation, who assisted with study planning, questionnaire assembly, quality control, and a myriad of other tasks as the work unfolded. Programming support was provided by Ms. Paula Obrebski, Ms. Chidori Inouye, and Mr. Robert Iwamiya, of Field Research Corporation's Information Technology department.

Dr. Lance Pollack and Dr. Joseph Catania, of the Health Survey Research Unit at UCSF, served as consultants to the team and assisted with sample and screening instrument design. Dr. Hao Tang oversaw all project activities on behalf of TCS.





## **Chapter 4:** About This Report

This report is the first based on data from the 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey. In it, we present data on the important tobacco control indicators and compare the LGBT data with that from CTS for the California general adult population. In some instances, comparable CTS data is not available. When it is not directly comparable, we will comment as best we can on comparisons between the two populations.

Chapter 5 presents these findings. Section 1 of Chapter 5 provides an overview of the demographic characteristics of the sample. Section 2 focuses on smoking and use of alternative tobacco products. Section 3 presents data on smoking cessation. Section 4 examines SHS exposure issues. Section 5 focuses on TI marketing efforts. Section 6 examines the impact of the California Tobacco Control Program. At the end of the report in Chapter 6, we offer concluding remarks and initial recommendations for tobacco control policy and program efforts directed at LGBT populations.

On two topics, smoking prevalence and cessation, we have compared our 2003 California LGBT Survey findings with those from previously published LGBT studies. These comparisons appear in Chapter 5, Sections 2.9 and 3.9. Comparable data on other tobacco control issues were not available from any previously published source.



# Chapter 5: Major Findings

## 1 Characteristics of California LGBT Population: An Overview

In this section we review the basic demographic characteristics of the survey population.

### 1.1 Identification of the LGBT Populations

As explained in the chapter on study methods, survey respondents were screened into the LGBT Tobacco Survey on three criteria: self-identification as gay, lesbian, or bisexual; reporting same-gender sex partners at some point in life; and/or self-identification as transgender or transsexual. (It is important to remember that gender orientation is different from sexual orientation and that some transgender individuals consider their sexual orientation to be gay/lesbian while others consider it to be heterosexual.) The screening questions asked individuals whether they were part of any of these three groups. If they answered affirmatively, they were invited to participate in the study. Later, at about mid-point in the interview, respondents were asked a detailed set of questions about their sexual and gender self-identification as well as whether, and when, they had most recently had sex with partners of the same gender. Responses to these questions are presented in Tables 1-1 and 1-2 below.

The distribution of the survey sample is reported in Tables 1-1 and 1-2 below. Table 1-1a shows that LGBT women outnumber LGBT men in California.<sup>9</sup> This latter finding is surprising since most other surveys have found the reverse pattern with regard to gender when questions on LGBT self-identification and behavior are imbedded in longer survey interviews of the general adult population (Lauman, et. al., 1994). Among self-identifying gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, the male/female proportions are about equal. It is among those who do not self-identify that females outnumber men. Within this grouping the female to male ratio is approximately 3:1.

In the first row of Table 1-1b, we see that 30.8% of all respondents were men who identified themselves as gay, bisexual (or homosexual and queer) and 29.7% were women who identified themselves as lesbian, bisexual (or homosexual, gay, or queer). The balance, 10.7% of males and 28.8% of females, either refused to supply a label for their current sexual orientation or said that they did not know what it was. Others rejected labeling altogether, or offered some other label such as “asexual,” “questioning,” “poly-sexual,” “occasionally bisexual,” or “formerly gay.” Significant numbers also reported that their current identification was heterosexual. Although these data are not presented in the tables in this section, about one-third of all females, and one in five males, replied that they currently thought of themselves as heterosexual.<sup>10, 11</sup>

As reflected in the tables below, there are clearly large portions of the LGBT population, as we defined it, that do not self-identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual even though they have had same-gender sexual experience. Interestingly, 45% of males who do not self-identify (n = 98) and 20% of females who do not self-identify (n = 116) said during the interview that they had never had sex with someone of the same gender. Some are transgender individuals. Others fall into the group that chose terms other than gay, lesbian, queer, or bisexual to describe their identity. A few are, in fact, heterosexuals reporting no same gender partners ever. However, many of these respondents reported being attracted to people of the same gender—a separate question was asked about attraction in the main body of the interview—an attribute not qualifying them officially for inclusion

---

<sup>9</sup> No independent data exist on the actual gender composition of the LGBT population. For this reason, no gender quota was implemented on the study. Since women typically are more likely to complete telephone surveys, it is possible that this study over-represented women. See the separate study methodology report for more information about this issue.

<sup>10</sup> Those who chose not to identify as gay, lesbian, queer, or bisexual have, for now, been grouped together in a category we have labeled, “Other LGBT.”

<sup>11</sup> Note that transgender individuals are not excluded. They are included in the sexual orientation group to which they assigned themselves.

into the study but one that these individuals seemed to take into account when responding to the screening questions. Those not reporting a current attraction to others of the same gender may well have felt such an attraction earlier in life and, hence, opted to participate in the study.

As discussed in the chapter on methods, for convenience, we will refer to sample members based on their response to the sexual orientation question. The groups we refer to as “gay/bisexual men” and “lesbian/bisexual women” refer to those who picked these labels to describe their sexual orientation.<sup>12</sup> The groups we refer to as “other LGBT men” and “other LGBT women” refer to those who did not know what their sexual orientation was, picked some other term, or refused to answer. We believe that these groups have significance for the development of smoking cessation and other tobacco control initiatives since those who do not self-identify as LGBT may require very different intervention approaches from those who do. In addition, the need for intervention may be greater since rates of smoking appear to be higher for at least some of the segments of the LGBT population who do not self-identify.

<b>Table 1-1a.</b>				
<b>Same-Gender Sex Behavior for LGBT Population</b>				
	<b>Current Gender Identification</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>Transgender Persons<sup>^</sup></b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Percentage of sample	100.0	41.5	58.5	2.0
Self-identify as ...				
<b>Sexual Behavior</b>				
Same gender sex ever (net)	86.3	85.0	87.3	81.7
Had same gender sex in last year	49.3	64.6	38.4	43.6
Had same gender sex 2-5 years ago	17.1	9.7	22.3	9.2
Had same gender sex 5+ years ago but since 18	17.3	7.4	24.3	28.5
Had same gender sex 5+ years ago but before 18	2.3	2.5	2.1	0.4
Unspecified	.4	.8	.2	-
Never had same gender sex	12.6	13.7	11.8	18.3
DK/Refused	1.1	1.4	0.9	-
N Unweighted	2,152	1,131	1,021	55

<sup>^</sup> Transgender persons are included in the Men/Women columns as well as in the Transgender column Source: 2004 California (CA) LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<sup>12</sup> Subsequent work with these data will isolate bisexuals specifically for analysis.

<b>Table 1-1b.</b> <b>Sexual Orientation and Same-Gender Sex Behavior</b>				
	<b>Self-Identified Sexual Orientation</b>			
	<b>Gay/Bisexual</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual</b>	<b>Other LGBT</b>	<b>Other LGBT</b>
	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Percentage of sample	30.8	29.7	10.7	28.8
Self-identify as ...				
<b>Sexual Behavior</b>				
Same gender sex ever (net)	96.6	94.8	51.6	79.5
Had same gender sex in last year	83.9	64.1	9.0	12.0
Had same gender sex 2-5 years ago	8.6	19.1	12.6	25.7
Had same gender sex 5+ years ago but since 18	3.3	11.1	19.2	37.8
Had same gender sex 5+ years ago but before 18	–	0.3	9.7	4.0
Unspecified	0.7	0.3	1.1	-
Never had same gender sex	3.0	4.3	44.5	19.6
DK/Refused	0.5	0.9	4.0	0.9
N Unweighted	970	563	161	458
N Weighted	632	608	220	591

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Table 1-2a and 1-2b indicate that 2% of all LGBT adults identify as transgender. There are no real differences between males and females in this regard. Of the four main subpopulations defined in terms of sexual orientation, data indicate that about 1% of gay/bisexual males, nearly 2% of lesbian/bisexual females, 6% of other males, and 2% of other females identify as transgender.

<b>Table 1-2a.</b> <b>Transgender Gender Identification</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Self-identify as transgender person	2.0	2.1	1.9

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 1-2b.</b> <b>Transgender Sexual Orientation</b>				
	<b>Gay/Bisexual</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual</b>	<b>Other LGBT</b>	<b>Other LGBT</b>
	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Self-identify as transgender person	0.7	1.7	6.2	2.1

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 1.2 Basic Demographics for LGBT Subpopulations

Table 1-3a and Table 1-3b both present summary information on the demographic characteristics of the California LGBT population and important subpopulations. In general, the data suggest that the California LGBT population, taken as a whole, is as diverse demographically as it is with regard to sexual behavior and identity.

An overwhelming majority of the LGBT population does not live in gay/lesbian enclaves. In fact, 78.8% of LGBT adults live in low-density areas of the state and only 6% live in high-density areas. More than one-quarter (26.6%) are married to, or partnered with, individuals of the opposite gender. Many also have children in their households, including 38.4% of all women in the sample. About half of gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women (49.2%) are out about their sexual orientation to all or most friends, family, and coworkers. The other half (49.4%) is out to only some people in these social networks. In terms of affiliation with the LGBT community, three-quarters (74.5%) have made at least some use of LGBT media or social outlets while about one in five males (18.3%) and three in ten females (30.7%) have not. When asked whether they felt a part of the LGBT community, 42.1% said yes. This percentage increases to 57.8% if you also include those who gave an ambivalent response. In terms of differences with the general adult population of the state, LGBT persons tend to be more white/non-Hispanic (70.2% compared with 46.7% of California adults generally); better educated (42.1% college graduates compared with 26.6% of adults generally); and more likely to reside in Northern California (49.2% compared with 39.1% of adults generally). In addition, the LGBT population seems to be younger: 8.2% of LGBT survey respondents were aged 65 or more compared with 14.6% of the California adult population.

This report is designed to merely provide an overview of these demographic data. The study collected some of the most important demographic information ever on the LGBT population and its further analysis will be a major focus of upcoming work.

<b>Table 1-3a.</b>				
<b>Basic Demographics for LGBT Populations</b>				
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CA Census 2000</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>				
Men	41.5	41.5	–	49.1
Women	58.5	–	58.5	50.8
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	14.3	12.7	15.4	13.6
25-29	10.8	7.5	13.1	10.1
30-44	35.6	34.4	36.4	33.7
45-55	21.7	22.1	21.5	17.5
56-64	9.3	10.9	8.2	10.5
65+	8.2	12.4	5.2	14.6
DK/Ref	0.1	–	0.2	–
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	70.2	69.6	70.6	46.7
Hispanic	14.9	15.5	14.5	32.4
African American	6.5	5.3	7.3	6.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.3	6.9	4.2	12.2
Other/DK/Ref	5.8	5.9	5.7	2.0

(continued next page)

**Table 1-3a. (continued)**  
**Basic Demographics for LGBT Populations**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CA Census 2000</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	7.8	5.7	9.3	23.2
High school graduate	15.2	14.6	15.7	20.1
Some college	34.8	30.4	37.9	30.0
College graduate or higher	42.1	49.3	36.9	26.6
Other/DK/Ref	0.1	0.1	0.1	–
<b>Employment Status<sup>^</sup></b>				
Employed	49.8	48.7	50.6	57.5
Self-employed	15.6	18.1	13.8	
Unemployed 1 year +	2.9	2.3	3.4	4.3
Unemployed < 1 year	6.4	5.6	7.0	–
Homemaker	4.2	1.0	6.5	–
Student	8.7	5.5	11.1	–
Retired	10.2	14.8	7.0	–
Disabled	7.5	6.9	7.9	–
DK/Ref	0.6	0.7	0.5	–
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	6.9	6.2	7.4	8.4
\$10K-\$19,999	12.0	10.5	13.0	11.2
\$20K-\$29,999	8.9	7.2	10.1	11.5
\$30K-\$49,999	16.7	14.1	18.6	20.9
\$50K-\$74,999K	16.9	18.0	16.2	19.2
\$75K-\$99,999K	13.4	14.1	12.9	11.5
\$100K-\$149,999K	10.8	11.9	10.0	10.4
Over \$150K	7.5	9.9	5.8	6.9
DK/Ref	6.9	8.0	6.1	–
<b>Part of California</b>				
Northern California	49.2	44.3	52.7	39.1
Southern California	50.8	55.7	47.3	60.9
<b>Region of California</b>				
Los Angeles	23.8	28.8	20.2	28.1
Orange	5.2	7.1	3.9	8.4
San Diego	9.3	8.6	9.8	8.3
Inland Empire	7.6	8.9	6.6	10.0
Central Valley	15.6	11.9	18.2	16.4
Central Coast	5.7	2.5	8.0	6.1
San Francisco Bay Area	29.1	29.3	28.9	20.0
North Coast/Sierra	3.7	2.9	4.3	2.7

(continued next page)



**Table 1-3a. (continued)**  
**Basic Demographics for LGBT Populations**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CA Census 2000</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>LGBT Density</b>				
Higher density	6.0	10.3	3.0	–
Medium density	15.2	19.5	12.1	–
Lower density	78.8	70.2	84.9	–
<b>Marital Status</b>				
Not partnered or DK	50.2	58.4	44.4	–
Cohabiting same gender partner	15.6	22.8	10.5	–
Cohabiting opposite gender partner	7.2	1.8	11.0	–
Married to same gender partner	7.6	6.1	8.7	–
Married to opposite gender partner	19.4	10.9	25.5	52.4
<b>Children in Household</b>				
0	72.2	87.1	61.6	–
1	12.9	5.7	18.0	–
2	10.5	4.2	15.0	–
3 or more	4.2	2.7	5.4	–
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers#</b>				
Most or all know	49.2	56.2	42.0	–
Some know	49.4	41.9	57.2	–
None know	0.9	1.2	0.7	–
<b>Disclosure of Transgender Status to Friends, Family, and Coworkers†</b>				
Most or all know	19.0	35.3	5.8	–
Some know	80.3	64.7	92.8	–
None know	0.4	–	0.7	–
<b>Ever Participated in LGBT Focused Activities, Media, Organizations, etc.</b>				
At least once	74.5	81.7	69.3	–
Never	25.5	18.3	30.7	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	42.1	50.1	36.5	–
Neither agree nor disagree	15.7	13.9	17.0	–
Disagree	40.8	34.5	45.3	–

^ Answers may be multiple. # Just asked of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. † Just asked of transgender persons. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CA Census 2000.

**Table 1-3b.  
Basic Demographics for LGBT Subpopulations**

	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men %</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women %</b>	<b>CA Census 2000 %</b>
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	15.4	4.8	18.7	12.0	13.6
25-29	7.1	8.6	15.8	10.3	10.1
30-44	33.5	36.9	34.7	38.3	33.7
45-55	25.2	12.9	20.2	22.9	17.5
56-64	10.1	13.3	7.9	8.4	10.5
65+	8.6	23.4	2.7	7.7	14.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	71.0	65.6	71.7	69.6	46.7
Hispanic	15.8	14.7	16.9	12.0	32.4
African American	5.2	5.4	8.2	6.4	6.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.7	4.4	3.3	5.1	12.2
Other/DK/Ref	3.5	12.8	2.0	9.6	2.0
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	4.4	9.4	7.4	11.2	23.2
High school graduate	13.4	18.0	10.8	20.8	20.1
Some college	32.2	25.1	40.3	35.6	30.0
College graduate or higher	50.0	47.2	41.4	32.4	26.6
Other/DK/Ref	0.1	0.3	0.3	–	–
<b>Employment Status<sup>^</sup></b>					
Employed	53.9	33.8	56.1	45.0	57.5
Self-employed	18.2	18.0	15.6	11.9	
Unemployed 1 year +	1.4	4.9	3.8	3.0	4.3
Unemployed < 1 year	4.7	8.1	7.3	6.6	–
Homemaker	1.2	0.4	1.4	11.7	–
Student	5.3	5.9	12.0	10.1	–
Retired	10.9	25.8	4.2	9.9	–
Disabled	8.0	3.8	5.2	10.8	–
DK/Ref	0.2	2.3	–	0.9	–
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	5.0	9.9	5.2	9.5	8.4
\$10K-\$19,999	9.6	13.1	11.2	14.9	11.2
\$20K-\$29,999	7.2	7.1	8.7	11.5	11.5
\$30K-\$49,999	14.7	12.6	19.1	18.1	20.9
\$50K-\$74,999K	16.5	22.6	18.2	14.1	19.2
\$75K-\$99,999K	14.3	13.5	13.9	12.0	11.5
\$100K-\$149,999K	12.5	10.2	12.2	7.7	10.4
Over \$150K	11.5	5.1	6.8	4.8	6.9
DK/Ref	8.8	5.8	4.8	7.3	–

(continued next page)

**Table 1-3b. (continued)**  
**Basic Demographics for LGBT Subpopulations**

	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men %</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women %</b>	<b>CA Census 2000 %</b>
<b>Part of California</b>					
Northern California	41.8	51.4	55.3	50.0	39.1
Southern California	58.2	48.6	44.7	50.0	60.9
<b>Region of California</b>					
Los Angeles	31.2	21.8	20.7	19.8	28.1
Orange	7.3	6.4	3.6	4.3	8.4
San Diego	8.7	8.5	8.5	11.2	8.3
Inland Empire	9.5	7.1	7.6	5.6	10.0
Central Valley	9.6	18.3	18.0	18.4	16.4
Central Coast	1.9	4.3	5.5	10.6	6.1
San Francisco Bay Area	29.9	27.6	32.3	25.5	20.0
North Coast/Sierra	1.9	5.9	3.9	4.6	2.7
<b>LGBT Density</b>					
Higher density	13.1	2.3	4.1	1.8	–
Medium density	23.2	8.7	15.9	8.3	–
Lower density	63.7	89.1	79.9	89.9	–
<b>Marital Status</b>					
Not partnered or DK	59.0	56.7	39.7	49.1	–
Cohabiting same gender partner	29.7	3.0	19.9	0.8	–
Cohabiting opposite gender partner	0.2	6.5	6.2	16.0	–
Married to same gender partner	8.2	–	16.8	0.3	–
Married to opposite gender partner	2.9	33.9	17.3	33.8	52.4
<b>Children in Household</b>					
0	90.0	78.8	64.7	58.4	–
1	5.0	7.8	16.1	19.9	–
2	2.2	10.2	15.8	14.1	–
3 or more	2.9	2.0	3.3	7.5	–
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers#</b>					
Most or all know	56.2	NA	42.0	NA	–
Some know	41.9	NA	57.2	NA	–
None know	1.2	NA	0.7	NA	–
<b>Ever Participated in LGBT Focused Activities, Media, Organizations, etc.</b>					
At least once	95.7	41.4	92.2	45.8	–
Never	4.3	58.6	7.8	54.2	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	64.9	7.5	56.2	16.2	–
Neither agree nor disagree	15.4	9.7	17.4	16.4	–
Disagree	18.7	80.3	26.2	65.0	–

^ Answers may be multiple. # Just asked of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. NA Not asked. – Zero cases or data is not available.

Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CA Census 2000.

## 2 Tobacco Use in California LGBT Subpopulations

In this section we report data on smoking behavior among the overall LGBT population, among men vs. women and among four important LGBT subpopulations: gay/bisexual men, lesbian/bisexual women, other LGBT men, and other LGBT women.

Parallel percentages for CTS are included in the tables, if available from purchased reports. A discussion of the similarities and differences in tobacco use patterns for the LGBT and general California population is included in Section 2.8. The last section (2.9) presents comparable smoking prevalence data from other published LGBT studies.

Throughout this report current smokers are defined as those who have smoked at least 100 cigarettes and report currently smoking. Among current smokers there are daily smokers who “smoke every day” and non-daily smokers who “smoke some days.” Former smokers are defined as those who have smoked 100 or more cigarettes in their life but report they do not smoke now even on some days. Never-smokers are those who have not smoked 100 cigarettes in their entire life.

### 2.1 Smoking Prevalence Among the LGBT Population and Subpopulations<sup>13</sup>

Overall, LGBT persons have a smoking prevalence of 30.4%. The rate for women (32.5%) is slightly higher than that for men (27.4%). LGBT women are more likely to be daily smokers than men (23.7% vs. 18.8%), though the genders are equally likely to be non-daily regular smokers (around 8.7%).

Among the subpopulations, gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women smoke at approximately the same rate (27.7% and 28.4%), and the women are slightly more likely to be daily smokers (22.8% vs. 19.1%). Gay/bisexual men are similar to other LGBT men in both these regards. Other LGBT women, on the other hand, smoke at a much higher rate than all other groups – 38.8%.

	<b>LGBT^ Overall</b>	<b>LGBT^ Men</b>	<b>LGBT^ Women</b>	<b>Transgender Persons</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>	<b>CTS Men</b>	<b>CTS Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Current smoker	30.4 (±2.9)	27.4 (±4.3)	32.5 (±3.9)	30.7	15.4 (±0.3)	19.1 (±0.5)	11.9 (±0.4)
Daily smoker	21.6 (±2.6)	18.8 (±3.7)	23.7 (±3.5)	*	–	13.4	8.9
Non-daily smoker	8.7 (±1.7)	8.6 (±2.7)	8.8 (±2.3)	*	–	5.7	3.0
Not current smoker	69.6 (±2.9)	72.6 (±4.3)	67.5 (±3.9)	*	–	80.9	88.1
Former smoker	27.8 (±2.8)	27.8 (±4.2)	27.8 (±3.6)	*	–	–	–
Never-smoker	41.8 (±3.1)	44.8 (±4.8)	39.7 (±4.0)	*	–	–	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. Includes partially completed interviews. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

<sup>13</sup> The term “LGBT population” is used to refer to the total sample of respondents and their grouping by men and women; the term “subpopulations” refers to our four major groups presented in these tables: gay/bisexual men, lesbian/bisexual women, other LGBT men, and other LGBT women. More detail about these groupings is presented in Section 1 of Chapter 5.

	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Men</b>	<b>CTS Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Current smoker	27.7 (±5.9)	28.4 (±6.2)	26.5 (±7.6)	38.8 (±5.6)	19.1 (±0.5)	11.9 (±0.4)
Daily smoker	19.1	22.8	19.6	26.3	13.4	8.9
Non-daily smoker	8.6	5.6	6.9	12.5	5.7	3.0
Not current smoker	72.3	71.6	73.5	61.2	80.9	88.1
Former smoker	25.8	25.5	34.8	30.1	–	–
Never-smoker	46.5	46.1	38.8	31.1	–	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 2.2 Smoking Prevalence for Demographic Subgroups

Considering age, smoking is highest among younger LGBT persons (43.4%), and declines to 13.6% for those ages 65 and over. The pattern is similar for LGBT men and women though the rates for women are higher in each age group. In regard to race/ethnic groups, smoking levels are similar except among LGBT women who are neither white nor Hispanic where smoking reaches 40.7%.<sup>14</sup>

Smoking appears to be highest among those with the least education. Those LGBT persons with less than a high school degree have a smoking prevalence of 55.7%. In this one category LGBT men's rate of smoking exceeds that of LGBT women (58.1% vs. 54.6%). Rates drop substantially into the 40% range for high school graduates, into the 30% range for those with some college, and the 20% or less range for those with a college degree or higher. The one exception is LGBT men who reach the 20% range for those with some college.

With the exception of the lowest income range (<\$10K), smoking rates by income category follow a pattern similar to that shown by education level. Those with household incomes in the \$10K to \$20K range have smoking levels in the 50% ranges which drops to 19.1% for the highest income levels. LGBT men's rates drop faster than those for women so that, for example, LGBT men in the \$20K to \$30,000 range are already down to a rate of 24.3% compared to the 49.2% rate for LGBT women.

Smoking by region of the state varies between a low of 25% for the Central Coast areas to a high of 51.6% for the North Coast and Sierra areas. The low rate for the Central Coast is predominately due to a low rate for LGBT men in that area (7.5%), and the high rate in the North Coast area is predominately due to the high rate for women (62.4%). The general trend for women to smoke at higher rates is observed in all areas except the Central Valley where rates for LGBT men and women are similar and above average (38% and 36.3%).

As a measure of social environment, we report smoking behavior by three categories of the "density" of the LGBT population. Density refers to the incidence of LGBT households as a percentage of all households. The areas referred to as higher density are central areas of San Francisco and West Hollywood where incidence is about 28%. Medium density areas have an incidence of between 10% and 15%. The lower density areas range from 5% to 7%. Overall, smoking appears to rise in the lower density areas but the patterns are very different for the subpopulations. For gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women, the rates smoothly increase as density decreases. For other LGBT men and women the patterns are inconsistent, i.e., smoking is highest for other LGBT men in the medium density area but lowest for women in the same area.

As a measure of psycho-social integration with the targeted population, all survey respondents were asked whether or not they felt they were a part of the LGBT community. The general pattern for the whole population and subgroups is that smoking is lowest for those who say they "neither agree nor disagree" that they feel part of the LGBT community (23.5% overall) and higher for those who either agree or disagree (31.4% to 34.2%).

<sup>14</sup> Due to small sample sizes, all respondents reporting a race/ethnicity other than Hispanic or non Hispanic white are grouped together.

**Table 2-2a.**  
**Smoking Prevalence for LGBT Population by Demographic Group**  
**Current Smokers**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Men</b>	<b>CTS Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>LGBT Overall</b>	30.4 (±2.9)	27.4 (±4.3)	32.5 (±3.9)	19.1 (±0.5)	11.9 (±0.4)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	43.4	37.4	47.0	21.0	11.9
25-44	33.9	31.5	35.3	20.8	12.7
45-64	25.2	24.7	25.6	19.8	13.4
65+	13.6	10.4	19.0	8.5	7.0
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	30.3	26.7	32.9	18.7	15.0
Hispanic	33.6	33.7	33.6	18.8	7.2
All others	34.2	25.5	40.7		
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	55.7	58.1	54.6	24.8	10.8
High school graduate	46.7	43.6	48.7	24.6	15.8
Some college	30.9	21.7	36.2	18.8	13.6
College grad or higher	20.6	22.5	18.8	11.2	7.5
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	37.0	35.9	37.7	25.2	17.8
\$10K-\$19,999K	52.6	52.8	52.5	24.4	17.0
\$20K-\$29,999K	40.8	24.3	49.2	23.3	15.0
\$30K-\$49,999K	30.9	24.9	34.2	21.6	14.1
\$50K-\$74,999K	28.8	27.3	29.9	19.8	11.6
>\$75K	19.1	19.1	19.1	17.2	10.0
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	29.8	31.8	27.9	–	–
Orange/San Diego	29.2	26.4	31.4	–	–
Inland Empire	33.6	24.5	42.3	–	–
Central Coast	25.0	7.5	29.4	–	–
Central Valley	36.8	38.0	36.3	–	–
San Francisco Bay Area	27.1	22.1	30.7	–	–
North Coast/Sierra	51.6	25.2	62.4	–	–
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	24.4	22.8	28.4	–	–
Medium density	27.8	29.2	26.3	–	–
Lower density	32.1	27.6	34.7	–	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	31.4	29.3	33.5	–	–
Neither agree nor disagree	23.5	17.6	26.9	–	–
Disagree	34.2	29.4	36.8	–	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 2-2b.**  
**Smoking Prevalence for Gay/Bisexual Men**

	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>			<b>CTS–Men</b>	<b>CTS–Overall</b>
	<b>Current Smokers</b>	<b>Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Non-Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	27.7 (±5.9)	19.1	8.6	19.1 (±0.5)	15.4 (±0.3)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	36.4	30.5	5.8	21.0	16.6
25-44	31.2	16.2	15.0	20.8	16.7
45-64	23.3	20.1	3.2	19.8	16.5
65+	13.9	8.8	5.1	8.5	7.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	27.6	20.6	6.9	18.7	16.8
Hispanic	35.5	20.3	15.1	18.8	13.0
All others	20.9	10.5	10.4	–	–
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	54.6	54.6	–	24.8	17.7
High school graduate	39.3	31.8	7.5	24.6	20.0
Some college	24.7	16.4	8.3	18.8	16.0
College grad or higher	24.2	14.4	9.8	11.2	9.4
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	46.6	37.5	9.1	25.2	22.5
\$10K-\$19,999K	51.6	28.9	22.6	24.4	21.9
\$20K-\$29,999K	29.3	15.3	14.0	23.3	19.7
\$30K-\$49,999K	23.6	20.4	3.2	21.6	18.3
\$50K-\$74,999K	27.4	22.0	5.4	19.8	15.5
>\$75K	20.4	13.4	7.0	17.2	13.2
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	32.1	21.2	10.9	–	–
Orange/San Diego	23.2	20.3	2.9	–	–
Inland Empire	29.3	20.1	9.1	–	–
Central Coast	*	*	*	–	–
Central Valley	33.0	19.4	13.6	–	–
San Francisco Bay Area	25.0	16.5	8.5	–	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	–	–
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	22.8	12.8	10.0	–	–
Medium density	25.8	19.3	6.5	–	–
Lower density	29.4	20.4	9.0	–	–
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers</b>					
Most or all know	33.7	24.9	8.8	–	–
Some know	19.8	12.2	7.6	–	–
None know	*	*	*	–	–

(continued next page)

**Table 2-2b. (continued)**  
**Smoking Prevalence for Gay/Bisexual Men**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			CTS–Men	CTS–Overall
	Current Smokers	Daily Smokers	Non-Daily Smokers	Current Smokers	Current Smokers
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	29.3	22.7	6.6	–	–
Neither agree nor disagree	16.8	10.9	5.9	–	–
Disagree	32.8	14.8	18.0	–	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 2-2c.**  
**Smoking Prevalence for Lesbian/Bisexual Women**

	Lesbian/Bisexual Women			CTS–Women	CTS–Overall
	Total Current Smokers	Daily Smokers	Non-Daily Smokers	Current Smokers	Current Smokers
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Total</b>	28.4 (±6.2)	22.8	5.6	11.9 (±0.4)	15.4 (±0.3)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	41.4	35.0	6.4	11.9	16.6
25-44	30.7	24.3	6.4	12.7	16.7
45-64	18.1	14.2	3.9	13.4	16.5
65+	0.5	–	0.5	7.0	7.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	29.2	24.2	5.0	15.0	16.8
Hispanic	26.9	17.8	9.1	7.2	13.0
All others	32.2	27.8	4.4		
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	40.3	40.1	0.2	10.8	17.7
High school graduate	50.6	44.5	6.1	15.8	20.0
Some college	37.7	30.9	6.7	13.6	16.0
College grad or higher	10.9	5.6	5.3	7.5	9.4

(continued next page)



<b>Table 2-2c. (continued)</b> <b>Smoking Prevalence for Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>					
	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>			<b>CTS–Women</b>	<b>CTS–Overall</b>
	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>	<b>Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Non-Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	33.7	31.5	2.3	17.8	22.5
\$10K-\$19,999K	55.1	50.4	4.7	17.0	21.9
\$20K-\$29,999K	48.2	38.0	10.2	15.0	19.7
\$30K-\$49,999K	27.4	23.3	4.0	14.1	18.3
\$50K-\$74,999K	29.7	20.2	9.4	11.6	15.5
>\$75K	12.0	7.5	4.5	10.0	13.2
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	23.3	19.1	4.2	–	–
Orange/San Diego	18.8	11.8	7.0	–	–
Inland Empire	40.8	35.2	5.6	–	–
Central Coast	7.7	7.7	–	–	–
Central Valley	37.4	35.0	2.4	–	–
San Francisco Bay Area	24.7	16.9	7.8	–	–
North Coast/Sierra	71.5	60.0	11.5	–	–
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	24.5	10.8	13.7	–	–
Medium density	27.6	17.3	10.3	–	–
Lower density	28.7	24.5	4.2	–	–
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers</b>					
Most or all know	24.1	20.5	3.6	–	–
Some know	31.0	23.9	7.1	–	–
None know	*	*	*	–	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	28.4	21.7	6.7	–	–
Neither agree nor disagree	28.2	21.6	6.6	–	–
Disagree	28.6	26.0	2.5	–	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 2-2d.**  
**Smoking Prevalence for Other LGBT Men**

	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>CTS–Men</b>	<b>CTS–Overall</b>
	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>	<b>Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Non-Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	26.5 (±7.6)	19.6	6.9	19.1 (±0.5)	15.4 (±0.3)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	*	*	*	21.0	16.6
25-44	32.4	22.1	10.3	20.8	16.7
45-64	30.0	22.8	7.2	19.8	16.5
65+	6.8	6.8	-	8.5	7.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	23.8	16.8	7.1	18.7	16.8
Hispanic	28.1	21.3	6.8	18.8	13.0
All others	35.1	29.5	5.5	–	–
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	62.9	62.9	–	24.8	17.7
High school graduate	52.9	36.0	16.9	24.6	20.0
Some college	10.5	7.4	3.1	18.8	16.0
College grad or higher	17.3	11.2	6.1	11.2	9.4
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	20.5	17.1	3.3	25.2	22.5
\$10K-\$19,999K	55.4	53.7	1.7	24.4	21.9
\$20K-\$29,999K	9.4	0.6	8.8	23.3	19.7
\$30K-\$49,999K	29.4	27.7	1.8	21.6	18.3
\$50K-\$74,999K	27.0	16.4	10.6	19.8	15.5
>\$75K	14.2	4.6	9.6	17.2	13.2
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	30.4	12.3	13.4	–	–
Orange/San Diego	36.3	36.3	–	–	–
Inland Empire	*	*	*	–	–
Central Coast	*	*	*	–	–
Central Valley	45.7	39.6	6.1	–	–
San Francisco Bay Area	13.3	9.4	3.9	–	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	–	–

(continued next page)

<b>Table 2-2d. (continued)</b> <b>Smoking Prevalence for Other LGBT Men</b>					
	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>CTS–Men</b>	<b>CTS–Overall</b>
	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>	<b>Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Non-Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	22.0	15.3	6.7	–	–
Medium density	55.1	39.8	15.4	–	–
Lower density	23.8	17.7	6.1	–	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	30.0	30.0	–	–	–
Neither agree nor disagree	21.2	18.9	2.3	–	–
Disagree	27.2	18.9	8.3	–	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

<b>Table 2-2e.</b> <b>Smoking Prevalence for Other LGBT Women</b>					
	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>			<b>CTS–Women</b>	<b>CTS–Overall</b>
	<b>Total Current Smokers</b>	<b>Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Non-Daily Smokers</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	38.8 (±5.6)	26.3	12.5	11.9 (±0.4)	15.4 (±0.3)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	55.9	42.8	13.1	11.9	16.6
25-44	40.2	29.5	10.7	12.7	16.7
45-64	32.5	18.0	14.6	13.4	16.5
65+	25.7	15.2	10.4	7.0	7.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	36.9	25.5	11.4	15.0	16.8
Hispanic	43.3	34.8	8.5	7.2	13.0
All others	46.3	27.2	19.0		
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	64.3	64.1	0.2	10.8	17.7
High school graduate	47.7	30.7	17.0	15.8	20.0
Some college	34.5	25.6	8.9	13.6	16.0
College grad or higher	29.1	11.1	17.9	7.5	9.4
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	39.9	39.7	0.1	17.8	22.5
\$10K-\$19,999K	50.5	35.3	15.2	17.0	21.9
\$20K-\$29,999K	49.9	29.9	20.0	15.0	19.7
\$30K-\$49,999K	41.5	29.4	12.1	14.1	18.3
\$50K-\$74,999K	30.3	22.4	7.8	11.6	15.5
>\$75K	29.0	15.8	13.1	10.0	13.2

(continued next page)

**Table 2-2e. (continued)**  
**Smoking Prevalence for Other LGBT Women**

Region	Other LGBT Women			CTS–Women	CTS–Overall
	Total Current Smokers	Daily Smokers	Non-Daily Smokers	Current Smokers	Current Smokers
	%	%	%	%	%
Los Angeles	32.7	24.8	7.9	–	–
Orange/San Diego	41.5	19.0	22.5	–	–
Inland Empire	44.5	44.5	–	–	–
Central Coast	41.3	29.7	11.5	–	–
Central Valley	35.2	30.8	4.4	–	–
San Francisco Bay Area	38.6	22.8	15.8	–	–
North Coast/Sierra	55.4	26.8	26.8	–	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				–	–
Higher density	37.5	26.4	11.1	–	–
Medium density	23.7	15.5	8.2	–	–
Lower density	40.2	27.3	13.0	–	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	51.9	23.9	28.0	–	–
Neither agree nor disagree	25.5	19.9	5.5	–	–
Disagree	40.3	29.4	10.9	–	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 2.3 Cigarette Consumption Among Current LGBT Smokers

Heavy smoking (25 or more cigarettes a day) is at 7% for the LGBT population, slightly higher for men (9%) and lower for women (5.9%). Looking at the subpopulations, it is highest for gay/bisexual men (11.1%) and lowest for other LGBT men (2.5%). The other LGBT men do tend to be older than the other subgroups and tend to display smoking patterns consistent with being older. Their smoking patterns are often unlike the other groups.

Moderate smokers (15 to 24 cigarettes per day) represent 22.6% of the LGBT population, a little more for men (25.8%) and a little less for women (20.8%). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual persons have a lower rate of moderate smoking (18% and 15.7%) than the other LGBT men and women (49.4% and 24.6%).

Women, and in particular lesbian/bisexual women, are most likely to be daily light smokers (under 15 cigarettes per day) at 56.5%. Men, and in particular gay/bisexual men, are most likely to be non-daily light smokers (30.9%).<sup>15</sup> The patterns are somewhat different for other LGBT men and women.

Additional descriptions of consumption levels by subpopulations and demographic groups is included in Section 3.2.

<sup>15</sup> Non-daily smokers are all considered to be “non-daily light” smokers.

**Table 2-3.**  
**Daily Cigarettes Consumption Per Day by Current LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation**

	Heavy (25+)	Moderate (15-24)	Light (<15)	Non-daily
	%	%	%	%
LGBT Overall	7.0	22.6	42.3	27.9
LGBT Men	9.0	25.8	35.2	29.7
LGBT Women	5.9	20.8	46.4	26.9
Gay/Bisexual Men	11.1	18.0	39.5	30.9
Lesbian/Bisexual Women	8.1	15.7	56.5	19.6
Other LGBT Men	2.5	49.4	22.0	26.1
Other LGBT Women	4.2	24.6	38.7	32.3
CTS Men	9.1	30.9	30.1	29.9
CTS Women	6.8	28.2	39.4	25.6

Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 2.4 Age at Onset of Smoking Among Current LGBT Smokers

About 25% of the LGBT population had their first cigarette at the age of 12 or younger. This is fairly consistent across the sub-groups, except for other LGBT men, for whom the rate is 47.3%. This may simply reflect the times when these older men were growing up. About 50% had their first cigarette between the ages of 13 and 17, about 20% between the ages of 18 and 24, and about 3% at age 25 or later. Daily smokers tend to have started smoking earlier than non-daily smokers.

**Table 2-4a.**  
**Age First Cigarette Smoked by Current LGBT Smoker by Subpopulation**

	Age			
	≤ 12 years	13-17 years	18-24 years	25+ years
<b>LGBT Overall</b>	25.6	51.0	20.5	2.9
Daily Smoker	26.1	52.4	19.9	1.6
Non-daily smoker	24.4	47.5	21.9	6.1
<b>LGBT Men</b>	27.1	46.4	23.6	2.9
Daily Smoker	28.2	45.5	25.3	1.0
Non-daily smoker	24.5	48.4	19.7	7.3
<b>LGBT Women</b>	24.8	53.7	18.6	2.9
Daily Smoker	24.9	56.2	16.9	2.0
Non-daily smoker	24.4	46.9	23.3	5.3
<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	20.4	51.8	24.3	3.4
Daily Smoker	22.6	49.8	26.8	0.7
Non-daily smoker	15.4	56.4	18.8	9.3
<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	23.3	52.1	22.4	2.1
Daily Smoker	26.5	49.9	21.1	2.5
Non-daily smoker	10.2	61.4	27.9	0.5
<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	47.3	29.9	21.5	1.3
Daily Smoker	43.8	33.3	21.1	1.7
Non-daily smoker	57.0	20.1	22.6	0.3
<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	25.9	54.9	15.7	3.5
Daily Smoker	23.5	61.8	13.1	1.5
Non-daily smoker	31.0	40.3	21.2	7.5

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Drawing on information from Tables 2-4a and b, we see that while 25.6% of LGBT persons tried their first cigarette at age 12 or younger, only about 7% of LGBT persons started smoking regularly at that age. About one in two current smokers started smoking regularly between the ages of 13 and 17 (48.7%), with about 35% starting between the ages of 18 and 24. Seven percent started at age 25 or older. The pattern is fairly consistent across the subpopulations though there is some evidence that women start smoking at a younger age than men.

	<b>Age</b>			
	<b>≤ 12 years</b>	<b>13-17 years</b>	<b>18-24 years</b>	<b>25+ years</b>
<b>LGBT Overall</b>	7.3	48.7	35.4	7.2
Daily Smoker	9.3	53.2	32.2	5.1
Non-daily smoker	2.2	37.1	43.7	12.5
<b>LGBT Men</b>	6.5	45.8	37.1	10.2
Daily Smoker	9.3	45.6	38.1	6.5
Non-daily smoker	–	46.2	34.6	19.0
<b>LGBT Women</b>	7.8	50.4	34.5	5.4
Daily Smoker	9.3	57.5	28.9	4.3
Non-daily smoker	3.7	31.3	49.5	8.4
<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	4.0	45.2	38.8	11.5
Daily Smoker	5.8	45.7	39.7	8.2
Non-daily smoker	–	43.9	36.8	19.0
<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	9.1	50.2	32.6	5.0
Daily Smoker	10.3	57.0	27.0	5.6
Non-daily smoker	4.0	22.7	55.8	2.6
<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	14.2	47.7	31.8	6.2
Daily Smoker	19.3	45.3	33.8	1.7
Non-daily smoker	–	54.4	26.4	19.1
<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	6.8	50.6	35.8	5.6
Daily Smoker	8.3	57.9	30.7	3.1
Non-daily smoker	3.5	35.2	46.7	11.0

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 2.5 Smoking Patterns for LGBT Non-Daily Regular and Former Smokers

Section 2.5 focuses on the patterns of smoking by those who are non-daily smokers and former smokers. This segment of smokers is of concern because of its susceptibility to returning to regular or daily smoking. The concern seems justified as it appears that being a former smoker does not mean total abstinence. Around 7% of former smokers reported smoking one or more cigarettes in the last 30 days (Table 2-6).<sup>16</sup> About 20% of former smokers have had at least a puff in the last year (Table 2-8). Given that about 10% reported that they had quit within the last year (Table 2-7), there appears to be a balance of about 10% of former smokers who have smoked in the last year.

Another indicator of susceptibility is how recently the person smoked regularly or daily. Just under 10% of the LGBT former smokers are within one year or less of being a regular smoker (Table 2-7). About 25% of former and non-daily smokers are within one year or less of being a daily smoker. In terms of targeting public health messages, there is possibly another 10% of the overall LGBT population (25% of non-daily and former smokers) that would be especially in need of help to avoid relapse. Additional survey findings concerning relapse are included in Section 3.7.

<sup>16</sup> If they had been counted as current smokers, the rate of current smokers (30.4%) would be almost 2% higher.

## 2.5.1 Elapsed Time Since Being a Daily LGBT Smoker

**Table 2-5.**  
**Elapsed Time Since Non-daily and Former Smokers Smoked on Daily Basis by Subpopulation**

	<b>Less than 6 months</b>	<b>6-11 months</b>	<b>In last year (net)</b>	<b>1-2 years</b>	<b>3-4 years</b>	<b>5 years or more</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
LGBT Overall	10.9	16.4	27.3	11.3	8.1	62.2
LGBT Men	8.8	14.9	23.7	11.1	6.4	66.5
LGBT Women	12.3	17.3	29.6	11.4	9.3	59.2
Gay/Bisexual Men	10.0	18.5	28.5	14.6	5.8	59.6
Lesbian/Bisexual Women	13.1	17.7	30.8	12.3	7.0	60.6
Other LGBT Men	5.6	5.6	11.2	2.2	7.8	84.4
Other LGBT Women	11.6	16.9	28.5	10.5	11.3	58.0

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 2.5.2 Recent Smoking by Former LGBT Smokers

**Table 2-6.**  
**Cigarettes Smoked in Last 30 Days by Former LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation**

	<b>None</b>	<b>Some^ (net)</b>	<b>1-2 cigarettes</b>	<b>3-5 cigarettes</b>	<b>6-9 cigarettes</b>	<b>10 or more cigarettes</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
LGBT Overall	92.6	7.4	2.8	1.5	0.5	1.9
LGBT Men	93.7	6.3	2.1	1.3	–	2.8
LGBT Women	91.8	8.2	3.3	1.7	0.8	1.3
Gay/Bisexual Men	94.5	5.5	0.6	0.7	–	4.0
Lesbian/Bisexual Women	90.3	9.7	4.6	1.6	1.7	1.1
Other LGBT Men	91.8	8.2	5.4	2.4	–	0.4
Other LGBT Women	93.2	6.8	2.2	1.7	–	1.5

^ (Net) includes don't know and refuse responses. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 2-7.**  
**Elapsed Time Since Smoking Regularly for Former LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation**

	<b>Less than 1 year</b>	<b>1-2 years</b>	<b>3-4 years</b>	<b>5 years or more</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
LGBT Overall	9.2	8.3	6.6	73.8
LGBT Men	8.7	5.2	4.3	78.4
LGBT Women	9.7	10.5	8.2	70.5
Gay/Bisexual Men	12.7	6.3	6.3	71.8
Lesbian/Bisexual Women	10.6	11.8	7.7	69.6
Other LGBT Men	0.1	2.8	0.1	92.4
Other LGBT Women	8.8	9.4	8.6	71.3

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 2-8.**  
**Elapsed Time Since Last Puff for Former LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation**

	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3-4 years	5 years or more
	%	%	%	%
LGBT Overall	20.8	10.6	5.3	63.3
LGBT Men	15.2	7.2	3.4	74.2
LGBT Women	24.8	13.0	6.6	55.6
Gay/Bisexual Men	18.4	9.8	4.3	67.5
Lesbian/Bisexual Women	23.7	8.2	7.4	60.7
Other LGBT Men	8.2	1.6	1.5	88.6
Other LGBT Women	25.7	17.1	6.0	51.1

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 2.6 Use of Other Tobacco Products (Cigars, Chewing Tobacco, and Snuff)

Six percent of the LGBT respondents reported having used cigars, chewing tobacco, or snuff at some point in their lives. The rate is higher for LGBT men (9.3%) than it is for LGBT women (3.7%). Cigars constitute the largest share of this alternative tobacco use with 7.1% of the LGBT men and 2.9% of the LGBT women reporting ever smoking cigars on a regular basis. At this point 3.7% of men and 1.4% of women currently smoke cigars on every or some days. Use of chewing tobacco and snuff follows a similar pattern, though at a lower level. In terms of age there is a small increase in use by men in the 25 to 44-year age range (5.3%), but it levels off at about 2% for older men.

**Table 2-9.**  
**Use of Cigars, Chewing Tobacco, and Snuff**

	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	CTS Men	CTS Women
	%	%	%	%	%
Never used cigars, chewing tobacco, or snuff	93.9	90.5	96.3	–	–
Used cigars, chewing tobacco, or snuff (net)	6.0	9.3	3.7	–	–
Ever smoked cigars on a regular basis	4.7	7.1	2.9	–	–
Currently smoke cigars every or some days	2.3	3.7	1.4	–	–
Among those who never smoked	1.0	2.2	–	5.1	0.5
Among former smokers	3.0	2.9	3.1	5.4	0.6
Among current smokers	3.4	6.7	1.5	14.6	3.9
Ever used chewing tobacco on a regular basis	1.8	2.8	1.2	–	–
Currently use chewing tobacco every or some days	0.1	0.2	–	–	–
Ever used snuff on a regular basis	1.1	1.8	0.7	–	–
Currently use snuff on every or some days	0.2	0.5	–	–	–
Currently Use Cigar by Age					
18-24 years	2.1	2.3	1.9	9.4	1.9
25-44 years	2.8	5.3	1.3	7.9	1.3
45-64 years	1.9	2.6	1.5	5.9	0.5
65+ years	1.6	2.6	–	3.5	0.3

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.



## 2.7 Cigarette Brand Preference

Cigarette brand preference is highest for Marlboro, one of the most heavily promoted brands, with 43.5% of men and 37.6% of women naming it as their preferred brand. The levels are even higher for gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women (51.9% and 45.7%). Other LGBT men show a high rate of using other brands (31.7%) whereas the other subgroups report preferring other brands at between 10.2% and 16.7%.

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
American Spirit	4.0	2.6	4.8	2.6	4.0	2.5	5.4
Basic	5.3	6.4	4.7	7.2	3.7	4.2	5.5
Benson and Hedges	3.7	2.5	4.5	3.3	0.7	–	7.3
Camel	9.4	7.7	10.3	6.6	11.9	11.1	9.2
Capri	1.0	1.4	0.8	0.4	0.3	4.2	1.1
Carlton	1.0	0.3	1.5	0.1	2.0	0.8	1.1
Generic	4.8	1.6	6.6	2.1	6.4	0.2	6.7
Kool	1.5	3.1	0.6	2.5	1.0	4.7	0.3
Marlboro	39.7	43.5	37.6	51.9	45.7	18.1	31.4
Merit	1.1	1.8	0.7	2.3	0.1	–	1.2
More	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.4	–	–	1.1
Newport	7.3	3.1	9.7	2.4	9.6	5.1	9.8
Pall Mall	0.3	0.8	–	–	–	3.4	–
Parliament	1.9	2.9	1.2	3.7	1.3	0.5	1.2
Salem	1.3	0.7	1.6	0.6	2.2	1.3	1.1
Vantage	–	–	–	0.1	–	–	–
Virginia Slims	1.1	0.2	1.6	0.3	1.0	–	2.1
Winston	2.9	2.6	3.1	1.7	2.6	5.4	3.4
Other	14.7	16.7	13.5	11.7	10.2	31.7	16.1
DK/Refused	2.5	4.3	1.4	2.7	1.3	9.3	1.4

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 2.8 Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey

Smoking prevalence for the overall LGBT population (30.4%) is about double that of the general population (15.4%) as found by the CTS (Gilpin, 2004). The difference is most pronounced among women where LGBT women smoke at a rate of 32.5% compared to CTS rate of 11.9% for women. The LGBT woman's rate is almost 200% higher than CTS woman's rate. The LGBT men's rate is higher but not as dramatically; it is about 50% higher than that for CTS men (27.4% vs. 19.1%).

LGBT women are more likely than LGBT men to be daily smokers (23.7% vs. 18.8%). This is in contrast to the findings for the general population where men are more likely than women to be daily smokers (13.4% vs. 8.9%).

Among the subpopulations, the comparisons are very consistent for men. Gay/bisexual men and other LGBT men smoke at a rate of between 26% and 27%. This is almost 50% higher than the rate for CTS men (19.1%). The relative proportion that are daily vs. non-daily smokers is similar (a little over two daily smokers for each non-daily smoker).

The differences between LGBT and CTS women are more varied and large. The rate for lesbian/bisexual women (28.4%) is higher by a factor of more than 100% over that for CTS women (11.9%). The overall prevalence rates for other LGBT women (38.8%) is greater than that for CTS women by over 200%.

These findings provide compelling evidence that smoking prevalence as well as probable addiction is a more serious problem among LGBT women than among either men or women in general or LGBT men.

Considering age, approximately the same pattern is observed between LGBT persons and the general population represented in CTS. That is, rates of smoking are quite high for young people, but prevalence declines with age. Some of the gap between the LGBT population and the general population closes as age increases. However, for those 65-years and older, LGBT rates are still higher than CTS rates.

Like age, prevalence declines for both LGBT persons and the general population as education increases, but even among those with a college degree or higher, the general population's rate is much lower than the LGBT rate. The same pattern occurs for income categories where smoking declines with each successive income category for both groups. In the highest income level (\$75,000 and higher), there is just a 2% difference between LGBT and CTS men (19.1% vs. 17.2%). However, in this high income category, there is a 9% difference between the women (19.1% for LGBT women vs. 10% for general population women).

The comparisons by region are only approximate as the two surveys used different criteria to group the state's counties. In the three areas where a rough comparison is possible (Los Angeles, Orange/San Diego, and San Francisco), smoking prevalence is double for the LGBT population in Los Angeles (29.8% vs. 14.7%) and double for Orange/San Diego (29.2% vs. 14.2%). For San Francisco the difference is just a little over 50% (27.1% vs. 17.2%). The smaller difference for San Francisco could reflect the fact the LGBT persons represent a higher proportion of the residents than in other places thereby affecting what is considered the rate for the general population. More likely, though, is the higher education and income levels of the San Francisco population where we see greater similarities between the LGBT and general populations.

As to consumption levels, the LGBT and CTS populations are very similar, at least in terms of the men and women. Heavy smoking is in the single digits. The rate of moderate smoking is in the low 20% range for LGBT men and women and the high 20% range for the general population. In the light smoker category the rate for LGBT men and women is about 5% higher than for CTS men and women. The LGBT and CTS populations are nearly identical in terms of the proportion of non-daily smokers (between approximately 25% and 30% of all smokers).

There is no exactly comparable published CTS data from the adult survey about the age respondents' first tried a cigarette or the age they began smoking regularly. Nor is there comparable information on smoking by former smokers or brand preference.

The last topic on which there is published CTS data that can be compared to LGBT Tobacco Survey findings concerns the use of alternate tobacco products. Among the general population 7.1% of all men and 1% of all women currently smoke cigars some days or everyday. The comparable figures for LGBT men is 3.7% and for women 1.4%. These are probably not significantly different rates.

The CTS found that current smokers are much more likely to be cigar smokers. Current cigar smoking among the general population jumps from about 5% for men who don't smoke cigarettes to 14.6% for men who currently smoke cigarettes. The same pattern is true among women, although the percentages are smaller. For the LGBT population the relationships are similar. The rate of cigar smoking goes from about 3% across LGBT men who don't smoke cigarettes to 6.7% for men who do smoke cigarettes.

## 2.9 Comparisons to Previously Published LGBT Studies

In this section we compare our estimates of smoking prevalence with those from other published LGBT studies. These studies did not all focus on exactly the same study populations and methodologies differed. For a brief descriptive overview of the other studies referred to below please see Appendix C of this report.

### 2.9.1 Recent Smoking by Former LGBT Smokers

Our smoking prevalence estimates for LGBT women are generally similar to those reported in the literature. Tang, in the most rigorous study to date (drawing on data from the 2001 CHIS, found that 25.3% of self-identified lesbians smoked, which is lower than the estimate from this study (32.5%). It should be pointed out, however, that we have yet to analyze smoking prevalence for lesbians only (as opposed to lesbians and bisexuals) so that may account for some of the difference. Lower rates of smoking were also reported in papers by Gruskin and colleagues (25.4%), Cochran and colleagues (21.2%), Valanis and colleagues (10.0-14.4%) and Diamant and colleagues (27%). Two prior studies, however, reported significantly higher estimates: 35.5% (Aaron, et. al., 2001) and 42.7% (Skinner and Otis, 1996).

### 2.9.2 Current Smoking Among LGBT Men

Our estimates of current smoking among LGBT males fall below previous estimates. Our estimates are that 27.4% of all LGBT men currently smoke compared with 27.7% of gay/bisexual men and 26.5% of other LGBT men. The most rigorous studies to date found that 31.4% of MSM (Greenwood, et. al., *In press*) and 33.2% of gay/bisexual men (Tang, et. al., *In press*) currently smoke. Earlier studies using convenience samples completely (Skinner and Otis, 1996), or in part (Stall, et. al., 1999), found that current smoking prevalence rates are 34.9% and 47.8%, respectively.

<b>Table 2-11a.</b> <b>Comparison of Smoking Prevalence Estimates from 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey</b> <b>with Estimates From Previously Published LGBT Studies</b>		
<b>Current Smoking</b>	<b>Previously Published LGBT Studies</b>	<b>2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey</b>
LGBT Women	Skinner (late 1980s): • 42.7% L* (late 1980) Diamant: • 27% L Valanis (1993-98): • 10.0% lifetime Lesbian behavior • 14.4% adult Lesbian behavior • 12.0% bisexual Aaron: • 35.5% L Cochran (1987-96): • 21.2% L Gruskin (1996): • 25.4% L Tang (2001): • 25.3% L	32.5% LGBT women 28.4% LB 37.6% Other LGBT
LGBT Men	Skinner (late 1980s): • 34.9% G* Stall (1999): • 47.8 combined MSM Greenwood (1999): • 31.4% combined MSM Tang (2001): • 33.2% G	27.4% LGBT men 27.7% GB 26.5% Other LGBT

\* L = self-identified lesbians; G = Self-identified gay men; combined MSM = both self-identified and other MSM.

### 2.9.3 Age Group Comparisons for Women

A prior study of 120 self-identified lesbians from Gruskin's 2001 survey of Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) members found higher smoking rates among younger lesbians. However, in the most rigorous published paper to date, Tang and colleagues (In press) found that middle-aged self-identified lesbians (35-44) reported the highest smoking rates (35.3%). We present smoking rates by age group below in order to allow for a side-by-side comparison of how findings from the 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey compare to prior reports. Our survey found higher smoking rates for every age group compared to those reported by Gruskin and colleagues. While smoking prevalence rates were largely similar for both the 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey and the household based data reported by Tang and colleagues, there was a notable difference in smoking rates among younger lesbians (20.9% for 18-34 vs. 47.0% for 18-24).

<b>Table 2-11b.</b> <b>Women's Smoking Prevalence Estimates by Age Group: Comparison of</b> <b>2003 CA LGBT Tobacco Survey with Other Published LGBT Studies</b>					
<b>Gruskin, et. al., 2001</b>		<b>Tang et. al.</b>		<b>CA LGBT Tobacco Survey</b>	
<b>1999 Estimates</b>		<b>2001 Estimates</b>		<b>2003-2004 Estimates</b>	
20-34	33.3%	18-34	20.9%	18-24	47.0%
35-49	29.1%	35-44	35.3%	25-44	35.3%
> 50	12.1%	45-66	25.6%	45-64	25.6%
				> 65	19.0%

### 2.9.4 Age Group Comparisons for Men

The 2003 California LGBT Tobacco Survey found higher smoking rates among younger gay-identified men (37.4% vs. 33% and 29.9% reported by Greenwood, et. al. and Tang, et. al., respectively), and lower rates among older (60-plus) men (10.4% vs. 19.5% reported by Greenwood, et. al.). These are similar to the findings reported above for lesbian/bisexual women, however, it is difficult to sort out the different smoking rates reported in each of the three studies because identical age group categories were not used.

<b>Table 2-11c.</b> <b>Men's Smoking Prevalence Estimates by Age Group: Comparison of</b> <b>2003 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey with Other Published LGBT Studies</b>					
<b>Greenwood et. al.</b>		<b>Tang et. al.</b>		<b>CA LGBT Tobacco Survey</b>	
<b>1999 Estimates</b>		<b>2001 Estimates</b>		<b>2003-2004 Estimates</b>	
18-29	33.0%	18-34	29.9%	18-24	37.4%
30-39	33.6%	35-44	41.4%	25-44	31.5%
40-49	30.9%	45-65	25.6%	45-64	24.7%
50-59	30.3%			> 65	10.4%
> 60	19.5%				

## 3 Smoking Cessation

In this section we begin by reviewing cigarette consumption levels as an indicator of nicotine addiction. We then report the data on smoking cessation. The section concludes with a discussion of the similarities and differences between the LGBT and general populations and comments on how our LGBT data compare with those from previously published LGBT studies.

All percentages reported in this section are based on smokers only, unless otherwise indicated.

### 3.1 Cigarette Consumption as a Measure of Nicotine Addiction

Cigarette consumption is perceived as a measure of addiction and, in turn, an indicator of likelihood of quitting smoking. Just over 70% of smokers in the LGBT population reported that they are light smokers. That is, they smoke fewer than 15 cigarettes a day or do not smoke every day.<sup>17</sup> That number is split between light non-daily smokers (about 30%) and light daily smokers (about 40%). Moderate smokers (smoke 15 to 24 cigarettes per day) constitute about a quarter of current smokers (22.6%). Fewer than one out of ten (7%) are heavy smokers (25 or more cigarettes per day).

LGBT women are a little more likely than LGBT men to be light smokers (73.2% vs. 64.9%). The difference mostly appears in the light daily smoker category where 46.4% of LGBT women are light daily smokers compared to 35.2% of LGBT men. LGBT men are slightly more likely to be moderate and heavy smokers.

When considering the four LGBT subpopulations,<sup>18</sup> the other LGBT men are less likely to report light smoking than the three other subpopulations. In terms of rates of heavy smoking, the two self-identifying groups (men as well as women) are similar to the LGBT population as a whole (11.1% for gay/bisexual men and 8.1% for lesbian/bisexual women). Other LGBT men (2.5%) and other LGBT women (4.2%) are somewhat less likely to smoke heavily. Much more so than LGBT women in general, lesbian/bisexual women are more likely to be daily light smokers compared to non-daily (56.5% light daily vs. 19.6% light non-daily).

The consumption patterns for other LGBT women more closely parallel the patterns for gay/bisexual men than patterns for non-LGBT women. Other LGBT men again show a unique pattern with relatively few light smokers (48.1% compared to 70.5% for gay/bisexual men), and a higher proportion of moderate smokers (49.4% compared to 18% for gay/bisexual men).

Table 3-1a. Cigarette Consumption Levels of LGBT Smokers						
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	Overall	CTS Men	Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Current Smokers</b>						
Light smoker (net)	70.2 (±5.3)	64.9 (±9.4)	73.2 (±6.6)	61.5 (±1.5)	59.7 (±2.3)	64.5 (±2.0)
Light non-daily	27.9 (±5.1)	29.7 (±9.2)	26.9 (±6.3)	–	–	–
Light daily	42.3 (±5.8)	35.2 (±9.4)	46.4 (±7.3)	–	–	–
Moderate smoker	22.6 (±4.9)	25.8 (±8.7)	20.8 (±6.0)	–	–	–
Heavy smoker	7.0 (±2.9)	9.0 (±5.2)	5.9 (±3.5)	–	–	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

<sup>17</sup> The phrase “light smokers” is used to describe those daily smokers who smoke less than 15 cigarettes a day and all non-daily smokers.

<sup>18</sup> The term “LGBT population” is used to refer to the total sample of respondents and their grouping by men and women; the term “subpopulations” refers to our four major groups presented in these tables: gay/bisexual men, lesbian/bisexual women, other LGBT men, and other LGBT women. More detail about these groupings is presented in Section 1 of Chapter 5.

**Table 3-1b.**  
**Cigarette Consumption Levels of LGBT Smokers by Subpopulation**

	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>CTS Men</b>	<b>Women</b>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Current Smokers</b>							
Light smoker (net)	70.5 (±10.4)	76.1 (±10.8)	48.1 (±15.8)	71.0 (±8.5)	61.5 (±1.5)	59.7 (±2.3)	64.5 (±2.0)
Light non-daily	30.9	19.6	26.1	32.3	–	–	–
Light daily	39.5	56.5	22.0	38.7	–	–	–
Moderate smoker	18.0	15.7	49.4	24.6	–	–	–
Heavy smoker	11.1	8.1	2.5	4.2	–	–	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

Table 3-2a displays the rates of light smoking for various demographic groups. Clearly, the portion of light smokers declines with age for LGBT men (75.3% for those LGBT men age 18 to 24 vs. 32.5% for those 65 and older). The pattern for LGBT women is quite different. The rate of light smoking for LGBT women ages 18 to 24 is very high (82.6%). It drops a bit for 25- to 44-year-olds (68.4%) but rises again to 71.4% for those 45 to 64 and to 98.7% for those 65 and older.

Considering race/ethnicity, non-Hispanic white LGBT men and women have similar rates of light smoking (61.3% and 67.6%). The rates jump for Hispanics to 79.4% for LGBT men and 90.1% for LGBT women. The rate then drops to its lowest point for men of other race/ethnicities (56.1%) but remains fairly high for LGBT women at 80.3%.

Patterns of light smoking by education show a consistent pattern for both LGBT men and women. Those LGBT men and women with less than a high school diploma are less likely to be light smokers (51.3% and 58%). The rate rises smoothly to 73.9% and 89.1% for those with a college degree or higher.

Patterns of light smoking by income category are inconsistent. Rates are high for men in the bottom three income categories (71.5%, 76.4%, and 67.4%), then decline in the \$30,000 to \$49,999 and \$50,000 to \$74,999 categories (52.8% and 54.6%), then rise again in the highest income category (over \$75,000) to 73.6%. LGBT women show a more even pattern where rates of light smoking begin at their lowest point (59.7%) for incomes under \$10,000 and rise steadily to reach 83.5% for those in the top income category (<\$75,000).

As to region, Los Angeles and San Francisco have two of the highest levels of light smokers (78.9% and 75.1%), but not the highest. The highest level is in the Inland Empire with a rate of 80%. The rest of the regions have rates in the 60% range with the Central Valley having the lowest rate at 56.3%. Between LGBT men and women, the pattern is fairly consistent with women displaying higher rates of light smoking than men. There is one exception, the Central Valley, whose low overall rate is a reflection of the very low rate for LGBT women (52.6%).

Considering respondents' sense of being part of the LGBT community, we see a familiar pattern. Those who "neither agree nor disagree" that they feel part of the LGBT community have the highest rates of light smoking (83.5%). Those who "agree" or "disagree" have lower rates (71.7% and 65.1%).

**Table 3-2a.**  
**Light Smokers<sup>^</sup> by Demographic Group**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS-Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	70.2 (±5.3)	64.9 (±9.4)	73.2 (±6.6)	61.5 (±1.5)
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	80.3	75.3	82.6	74.3
25-44	68.0	67.3	68.4	66.4
45-64	66.5	60.1	71.4	48.0
65+	66.7	32.5	98.7	50.7
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	65.3	61.3	67.6	49.3
Hispanic	85.5	79.4	90.1	81.7
All others	72.6	56.1	80.3	–
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	55.9	51.3	58.0	63.9
High school graduate	62.7	60.6	63.9	56.4
Some college	71.8	60.4	75.7	61.5
College grad or higher	81.1	73.9	89.1	68.3
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	64.0	71.5	59.7	64.9
\$10K-\$19,999K	69.8	76.4	66.0	64.9
\$20K-\$29,999K	68.0	67.4	68.1	60.9
\$30K-\$49,999K	69.7	52.8	76.3	58.7
\$50K-\$74,999K	70.3	54.6	81.6	62.1
>\$75K	78.8	73.6	83.5	59.4
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	78.9	66.2	93.6	–
Orange/San Diego	63.8	51.1	72.4	–
Inland Empire	80.0	76.3	82.0	–
Central Coast	69.8	*	71.3	–
Central Valley	56.3	63.8	52.6	–
San Francisco Bay Area	75.1	70.3	77.6	–
North Coast/Sierra	61.2	*	62.0	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	78.3	75.7	83.6	–
Medium density	69.4	59.0	82.5	–
Lower density	69.8	65.3	71.9	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	71.7	68.5	74.4	–
Neither agree nor disagree	83.5	78.4	85.5	–
Disagree	65.1	56.1	69.0	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. <sup>^</sup> This includes all non-daily smokers and daily smokers who consumer less than 15 cigarettes per day. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

Table 3-2b displays the rates of light smoking for the four major subpopulations by demographic groups. Focusing specifically on gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women, patterns are similar to those described above for LGBT men and women. Both have fairly high levels of light smoking among the youngest people (82.4% and 85.3%). The rate then drops for men and women in the 25- to 44-year-old range (73.9% and 69.4%), and continues to drop for men in the 45- to 64-year-old age group (61.7%). It goes back up, though, for women in this age range (82.7%).

A major contributor to the high rate of light smoking among lesbian/bisexual women is the high rate (99%) among women of both Hispanic and other race/ethnicities. The rate of light smoking for gay/bisexual men is also at its highest for Hispanics (85.4%).

The patterns by income and education are inconsistent in a manner similar to those for the overall population. Light smoking drops to 45.2% for lesbian/bisexual women with a high school degree but rises for those with less than a high school education (71.2%), some college (83.3%) and a college degree or higher (91.0%). For gay/bisexual men the lowest rate is for those with some college (56.8%). This rises substantially for those with just a high school degree (70.1%) and those with a college degree or higher (79.9%). Gay/bisexual men show a similar U-shaped curve when considering income levels, though lesbian/bisexual women show a consistent rise in light smoking as income rises.

Findings by region and LGBT density present no clear pattern. Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals who are more “out” (most or all friends/family) tend to have lower rates of light smoking compared to those for whom only some friends or family know. In regard to feeling part of the LGBT community, the same pattern is observed as for the whole LGBT population. That is, those who “neither agree nor disagree” that they feel part of the LGBT community have the highest levels of light smoking (79% for gay/bisexual men and 99.8% for lesbian/bisexual women).

<b>Table 3-2b.</b> <b>Light Smokers^ by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups</b>					
	<b>Current Smokers</b>				
	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS—Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	70.5 (±10.4)	76.1 (±10.8)	48.1 (±15.8)	71.0 (±8.5)	61.5 (±1.5)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	82.4	85.3	*	79.4	74.3
25-44	73.9	69.4	50.8	67.6	66.4
45-64	61.7	82.7	55.2	65.6	48.0
65+	*	*	*	*	50.7
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	65.3	67.7	47.1	67.4	49.3
Hispanic	85.4	99.5	*	81.6	81.7
All others	70.2	100.0	*	71.2	—
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	*	71.2	*	52.5	63.9
High school graduate	70.1	45.2	*	74.5	56.4
Some college	56.8	83.3	*	66.0	61.5
College grad or higher	79.9	91.0	48.4	88.1	68.3

(continued next page)



**Table 3-2b. (continued)**  
**Light Smokers<sup>^</sup> by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	Current Smokers				
	Gay/ Bisexual Men	Lesbian/ Bisexual Women	Other LGBT Men	Other LGBT Women	CTS— Overall
	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	85.0	67.7	*	56.0	64.9
\$10K-\$19,999K	83.6	62.0	*	69.3	64.9
\$20K-\$29,999K	63.8	74.6	*	63.3	60.9
\$30K-\$49,999K	63.5	83.0	*	71.6	58.7
\$50K-\$74,999K	57.7	91.9	*	68.2	62.1
>\$75K	74.5	82.5	*	84.0	59.4
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	65.1	90.4	*	96.0	—
Orange/San Diego	74.9	91.3	*	65.6	—
Inland Empire	77.8	*	*	*	—
Central Coast	*	*	*	68.4	—
Central Valley	*	62.7	*	41.8	—
San Francisco Bay Area	72.9	82.5	55.0	73.6	—
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	*	—
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	76.3	92.8	*	69.4	—
Medium density	56.7	85.7	67.4	75.2	—
Lower density	73.9	73.6	43.3	70.8	—
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers</b>					
Most or all know	67.6	67.5	NA	NA	—
Some know	75.1	80.4	NA	NA	—
None know	*	*	NA	NA	—
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	69.9	71.1	*	80.7	—
Neither agree nor disagree	79.0	99.8	*	68.3	—
Disagree	68.5	71.3	46.1	68.3	—

\* Suppressed due to small number. NA Not asked. — Zero cases or data is not available. <sup>^</sup> This includes all non-daily smokers and daily smokers who consumer less than 15 cigarettes per day. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 3.2 Quitting History

The following tables display data on quit attempts in the last year that lasted a day or more (Table 3-3 series) and attempts that lasted a week or more (Table 3-4 series). Also reported is the percentage of smokers quitting for a year or more after smoking regularly (Table 3-5 series). Smoking research has shown that those who attempt to quit are more likely to eventually quit. Quit attempts also reflect the effectiveness of health promotion efforts to affect smokers' behaviors.

About three out of five LGBT smokers (62.7%) made a quit attempt lasting one or more days. Two out of five (39.1%) made a quit attempt that lasted one week or more. One out of five (22%) reported a quit attempt that lasted one year or longer. In general, LGBT women are more likely than LGBT men to try to quit though they are approximately the same with regard to long-

term quitting. Among LGBT women, 66.6% quit for one day or more compared to 55.9% of LGBT men. Considering attempts that lasted a week or longer, the rate for LGBT women was 41.8% compared to 34.5% for LGBT men. The gender gap narrows even more when considering quit attempts lasting a year or longer (23.4% and 19.5%).

The incidence of quit attempts across age groups is fairly similar with older people having an understandably higher rate of the longest attempts. Hispanics and those of other race/ethnicities are more likely to have quit for a day or more (about 70% compared to about 60% for non-Hispanic whites), are equally likely to have quit for a week or more, and are less likely to have quit for a year or more (about 13% for Hispanics compared to about 25% for non-Hispanic whites).

Quit attempts of a day or longer, a week or longer, or a year or longer have no consistent relationship to education or income.

With regard to region, Los Angeles is among the lowest in quit attempts of a day or more (51.4%) and a week or more (29.5%), and has the lowest number of quit attempts lasting a year or longer (11.2%). San Francisco is just about average in the rates of one day and one week quit attempts (62% and 39.2%) but has the highest rate of quit attempts lasting one year or more (31.7%). Orange/San Diego has some of the highest rates of one day and one week quit attempts (75.3% and 57%), and the second highest rate of quit attempts lasting a year or longer (27.6%).

Those most likely to have quit for a year or more are LGBT men and women who have college degree or higher, incomes in the \$20,000-\$49,999 range, live in San Francisco and do not feel a part of the LGBT community. Those least likely to quit for a year or more are 18- to 24-year-old LGBT men and women who are Hispanic or another race/ethnicity, have less than a high school degree, are in the \$10,000-\$19,999 income range, live in the Los Angeles area, and feel they are a part of the LGBT community.

**Table 3-3a.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One or More Days in the Last Year**  
**by Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			<b>CTS - % Making 1+ Day Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	62.7	—	—	62.1 (+/-1.2)
Men	—	55.9	—	63.5
Women	—	—	66.6	59.8
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	68.1	54.3	74.5	79.5
25-44	65.9	54.6	71.9	63.6
45-64	50.5	57.2	45.4	51.8
65+	68.3	65.8	*	47.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	59.9	59.7	60.0	55.9
Hispanic	69.8	57.8	78.9	73.0
All others	70.2	40.3	84.1	—
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	49.7	29.5	59.1	63.7
High school graduate	70.7	56.5	79.0	58.5
Some college	59.4	54.3	61.1	64.2
College grad or higher	66.2	64.0	68.6	63.3

(continued next page)

**Table 3-3a. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One or More Days in the Last Year**  
**by Demographic Groups**

	Current Smokers			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	CTS - % Making 1+ Day Quit Attempt
	%	%	%	%
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	68.1	53.5	76.6	63.0
\$10K-\$19,999K	54.5	50.4	56.8	63.0
\$20K-\$29,999K	75.2	76.5	74.9	62.2
\$30K-\$49,999K	66.2	55.0	70.6	60.5
\$50K-\$74,999K	63.9	54.7	70.6	63.9
>\$75K	60.2	55.0	64.7	60.7
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	51.4	52.4	50.2	–
Orange/San Diego	75.3	86.1	68.0	–
Inland Empire	78.7	67.8	84.8	–
Central Coast	69.5	*	70.4	–
Central Valley	55.4	35.9	64.9	–
San Francisco Bay Area	62.0	52.6	66.9	–
North Coast/Sierra	73.3	*	78.2	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	53.2	52.5	54.7	–
Medium density	60.9	59.5	62.6	–
Lower density	63.5	55.2	67.4	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	69.9	62.0	76.7	–
Neither agree nor disagree	70.7	69.8	71.0	–
Disagree	53.8	44.0	58.0	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 3-3b.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One or More Days in the Last Year**  
**by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>				
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS - % Making 1+ Day Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Gender</b>					
Men	63.1	–	34.0	–	63.5
Women	–	66.4	–	66.7	59.8
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	49.9	75.2	*	73.7	79.5
25-44	66.3	73.0	25.9	71.1	63.6
45-64	62.4	33.3	41.4	51.6	51.8
65+	*	*	*	*	47.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	67.3	60.6	32.1	59.4	55.9
Hispanic	57.1	79.3	*	78.6	73.0
All others	45.1	91.6	*	80.6	–
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	*	72.0	*	53.6	63.7
High school graduate	76.4	80.1	*	78.4	58.5
Some college	57.7	61.5	*	60.5	64.2
College grad or higher	67.1	60.5	50.7	72.7	63.3
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	44.3	79.5	*	75.2	63.0
\$10K-\$19,999K	72.9	71.5	*	44.5	63.0
\$20K-\$29,999K	73.9	89.1	*	64.3	62.2
\$30K-\$49,999K	56.3	64.4	*	75.0	60.5
\$50K-\$74,999K	62.2	64.9	*	77.9	63.9
>\$75K	58.1	54.0	*	70.9	60.7
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	59.8	41.6	*	56.8	–
Orange/San Diego	89.6	58.8	*	71.3	–
Inland Empire	68.8	*	*	*	–
Central Coast	*	*	*	67.4	–
Central Valley	*	75.4	*	53.6	–
San Francisco Bay Area	47.0	66.8	85.6	66.9	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	*	–

(continued next page)

**Table 3-3b. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One or More Days in the Last Year**  
**by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>				<b>CTS - % Making 1+ Day Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	52.5	53.0	*	57.4	–
Medium density	57.2	62.3	67.5	63.5	–
Lower density	66.7	67.8	26.0	67.1	–
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers</b>					
Most or all know	60.2	67.3	NA	NA	–
Some know	68.1	67.2	NA	NA	–
None know	*	*	NA	NA	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	63.7	73.4	*	83.1	–
Neither agree nor disagree	80.1	83.4	*	56.0	–
Disagree	53.8	40.4	36.1	63.2	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. NA Not asked. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 3-4a.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One Week or**  
**More in the Last Year by Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			<b>CTS - % Making Week + Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	39.1	–	–	40.5 (+/-1.5)
Men	–	34.5	–	41.4
Women	–	–	41.8	39.0
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	36.1	37.0	35.7	56.1
25-44	43.9	35.3	48.6	41.2
45-64	33.0	33.0	32.9	31.8
65+	36.1	26.7	*	30.1
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	40.1	36.4	42.2	36.0
Hispanic	36.2	34.3	37.7	50.9
All others	36.2	19.8	43.9	–

(continued next page)

**Table 3-4a. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One Week or**  
**More in the Last Year by Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS - % Making Week + Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	28.5	13.2	35.6	40.7
High school graduate	39.9	38.2	40.9	36.2
Some college	40.1	38.9	40.6	43.1
College grad or higher	42.9	35.9	50.9	43.7
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	33.7	48.9	24.9	41.0
\$10K-\$19,999K	28.3	35.9	23.9	41.5
\$20K-\$29,999K	54.4	32.2	59.9	38.8
\$30K-\$49,999K	44.0	39.7	45.6	39.3
\$50K-\$74,999K	33.1	26.8	37.7	40.5
>\$75K	47.7	32.5	61.2	41.2
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	29.5	32.3	26.3	–
Orange/San Diego	57.0	63.9	52.2	–
Inland Empire	51.3	36.9	59.2	–
Central Coast	50.4	*	53.6	–
Central Valley	35.9	28.7	39.4	–
San Francisco Bay Area	39.2	26.8	45.6	–
North Coast/Sierra	22.6	*	26.4	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	36.6	36.7	36.5	–
Medium density	36.9	36.8	37.2	–
Lower density	39.7	33.6	42.5	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	44.4	39.8	48.3	–
Neither agree nor disagree	36.6	39.7	35.4	–
Disagree	34.9	25.8	38.9	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 3-4b.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One Week or More in the Last Year**  
**by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>				
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men %</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women %</b>	<b>CTS - % Making Week + Quit Attempt %</b>
<b>Gender</b>					
Men	39.7	–	18.8	–	41.4
Women	–	41.8	–	41.9	39.0
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	33.1	43.6	*	26.4	56.1
25-44	42.6	50.3	17.1	47.2	41.2
45-64	39.9	13.6	12.4	42.9	31.8
65+	*	*	*	*	30.1
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	41.6	39.2	17.6	44.8	36.0
Hispanic	38.4	49.8	*	26.9	50.9
All others	20.7	54.7	*	39.0	–
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	*	48.9	*	30.0	40.7
High school graduate	58.1	46.7	*	37.6	36.2
Some college	41.4	41.3	*	39.6	43.1
College grad or higher	38.3	35.6	25.5	58.4	43.7
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	41.6	12.7	*	30.7	41.0
\$10K-\$19,999K	52.7	28.8	*	19.7	41.5
\$20K-\$29,999K	25.5	73.8	*	49.5	38.8
\$30K-\$49,999K	51.0	45.8	*	45.5	39.3
\$50K-\$74,999K	36.0	47.2	*	25.3	40.5
>\$75K	31.7	45.8	*	70.0	41.2
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	37.6	23.9	*	28.2	–
Orange/San Diego	70.8	37.1	*	57.7	–
Inland Empire	36.2	*	*	*	–
Central Coast	*	*	*	59.1	–
Central Valley	*	51.3	*	26.6	–
San Francisco Bay Area	24.9	47.5	38.0	44.0	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	*	–
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	36.8	39.8	*	31.5	–
Medium density	37.3	39.8	34.9	31.0	–
Lower density	40.9	42.3	14.8	42.7	–

(continued next page)

**Table 3-4b. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Made a Quit Attempt of One Week or More in the Last Year**  
**by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	Current Smokers				CTS - % Making Week + Quit Attempt
	Gay/ Bisexual Men	Lesbian/ Bisexual Women	Other LGBT Men	Other LGBT Women	
	%	%	%	%	
Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers					
Most or all know	33.4	43.6	NA	NA	—
Some know	51.2	41.9	NA	NA	—
None know	*	*	NA	NA	—
Feel Part of LGBT Community					
Agree	41.0	43.4	*	58.1	—
Neither agree nor disagree	47.7	41.6	*	28.0	—
Disagree	32.0	38.7	20.8	38.9	—

\* Suppressed due to small number. NA Not asked. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 3-5a.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Had a Quit Attempt of One Year or Longer in the Last Year**  
**Since Smoking Regularly by Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			<b>CTS - % Making Year + Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	22.0	–	–	22.0 (+/-1.3)
Men	–	19.5	–	21.1
Women	–	–	23.4	23.4
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	10.3	15.1	8.1	9.8
25-44	24.3	14.3	29.6	24.1
45-64	27.9	33.3	23.9	26.2
65+	14.7	1.7	27.0	18.1
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	25.1	21.2	27.3	23.1
Hispanic	12.8	7.9	16.4	21.1
All others	13.7	21.4	10.1	–
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	15.3	11.5	17.1	18.9
High school graduate	21.7	6.2	30.9	24.2
Some college	17.7	24.6	15.3	23.8
College grad or higher	30.9	26.0	36.4	27.7

(continued next page)



**Table 3-5a. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Had a Quit Attempt of One Year or Longer in the Last Year**  
**Since Smoking Regularly by Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS - % Making Year + Quit Attempt</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	18.6	32.0	10.9	12.9
\$10K-\$19,999K	12.1	12.1	12.2	23.2
\$20K-\$29,999K	29.3	16.6	32.5	18.6
\$30K-\$49,999K	29.9	7.1	38.9	24.5
\$50K-\$74,999K	19.5	20.9	18.5	23.5
>\$75K	23.4	25.7	21.4	23.3
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	11.2	12.9	9.3	–
Orange/San Diego	27.6	19.7	32.9	–
Inland Empire	14.0	21.0	10.1	–
Central Coast	25.4	*	27.0	–
Central Valley	22.0	29.0	18.5	–
San Francisco Bay Area	31.7	24.2	35.5	–
North Coast/Sierra	18.2	*	21.2	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	30.8	28.9	34.7	–
Medium density	28.3	26.2	30.9	–
Lower density	20.4	16.3	22.3	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	18.5	16.0	20.6	–
Neither agree nor disagree	21.1	21.6	20.9	–
Disagree	25.6	24.2	26.2	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 3-5b.**  
**LGBT Smokers in the Last Year Who Had Quit Attempts of One Year or Longer**  
**by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>				
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men %</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men %</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women %</b>	<b>CTS - % Making Year + Quit Attempt %</b>
<b>Gender</b>					
Men	17.6	–	25.1	–	21.1
Women	–	23.5	–	23.4	23.4
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	8.0	0.6	*	17.0	9.8
25-44	12.1	34.3	19.5	25.9	24.1
45-64	34.7	25.3	28.9	23.2	26.2
65+	*	100.0	*	*	18.1
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	18.0	24.9	32.7	29.4	23.1
Hispanic	9.7	22.0	*	11.4	21.1
All others	23.6	11.0	*	9.7	–
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	*	30.1	*	11.6	18.9
High school graduate	10.1	43.1	*	23.9	24.2
Some college	25.3	13.7	*	17.3	23.8
College grad or higher	19.3	29.8	54.6	39.7	27.7
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	19.5	3.7	*	14.4	12.9
\$10K-\$19,999K	16.7	14.5	*	10.2	23.2
\$20K-\$29,999K	18.4	39.0	*	27.6	18.6
\$30K-\$49,999K	7.5	45.6	*	34.1	24.5
\$50K-\$74,999K	15.1	20.6	*	15.6	23.5
>\$75K	23.4	14.5	*	25.4	23.3
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	13.4	14.1	*	5.7	–
Orange/San Diego	4.2	30.4	*	33.8	–
Inland Empire	22.2	*	*	*	–
Central Coast	*	*	*	29.8	–
Central Valley	*	27.4	*	9.0	–
San Francisco Bay Area	23.8	35.5	26.1	35.5	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	*	–

(continued next page)

**Table 3-5b. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers in the Last Year Who Had Quit Attempts of One Year or Longer**  
**by Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	Current Smokers				CTS - % Making Year + Quit Attempt
	Gay/ Bisexual Men	Lesbian/ Bisexual Women	Other LGBT Men	Other LGBT Women	
	%	%	%	%	
	%	%	%	%	
Density Areas					
Higher density	29.3	34.9	*	34.3	–
Medium density	23.1	27.8	37.2	37.9	–
Lower density	14.0	22.2	22.4	22.4	–
Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers					
Most or all know	16.4	35.5	NA	NA	–
Some know	16.2	17.3	NA	NA	–
None know	*	*	NA	NA	–
Feel Part of LGBT Community					
Agree	16.2	27.1	*	8.0	–
Neither agree nor disagree	24.5	12.1	*	31.6	–
Disagree	19.0	23.3	28.4	27.0	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. NA Not asked. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

### 3.3 Workplace and Home Smoking Bans

Spending time in places that restrict smoking has been associated with greater success in quitting. Overall, just under 40% of LGBT men and women both work and live in places where smoking is restricted. The number drops into the mid-20% range when considering just smokers. This drop is due in part to smokers who do not totally restrict smoking at home (as opposed to workplaces that do not restrict smoking) making this a focus for public health initiatives.

**Table 3-6.**  
**Both Workplace and Home Smoking Restrictions by Smoking Status**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	39.2	39.3	39.2	–
Just smokers	25.2	–	–	24.1
Men	–	23.6	–	23.6
Women	–	–	26.1	24.8

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

### 3.4 Smoking Cessation Assistance

NRT is the cessation aid most commonly used by LGBT men and women in their most recent quit attempt lasting one day or longer. One out of four (25%) of these quitters used NRT. It is most popular among moderate and heavy smokers where two out of five (37.2%) quitters report using it. LGBT men are, in general, more likely than women to use NRT except among moderate and heavy smokers where the rates for men and women are similar (38.8% and 36%).

Considering use of NRT by demographic groups, younger LGBT persons (aged 18 to 24) are least likely to use it (12.3%) and older LGBT persons (25 years and older) are the most likely (in the range of 29.1% to 31.9%).

Substantial differences are seen between LGBT persons of different race/ethnicities with non-Hispanic whites (32.3%) being three times as likely to use NRT as Hispanics (10.7%) and those of other race/ethnicities (14.5%). These differences are largest for LGBT men.

Among LGBT men and women, those with less than a high school degree are more likely to use NRT (57.2% for men and 31.1% for women). Use by LGBT men and women at other education and income levels varies in an inconsistent fashion as does use by region.

There is evidence to suggest that use of NRT is higher in areas with a higher density of LGBT persons (43.9% for men and 27.8% for women) compared to areas of lower density (27.6% for men and 22.4% for women). Those who feel they are a part of the LGBT community are more likely to use NRT (44.4% for men and 28.7% for women) compared to others (all below 19.5%).

While NRT is the most popular form of cessation assistance, there is some thought that its effectiveness in helping smokers quit for a year or more is declining (DHS TCS, 2000). Among the LGBT men and women who report quitting for 12 months or longer, about 10% report using NRT.

In general, counseling advice, self-help materials, and smoking cessation groups are used at lower levels (9.5%, 13.2%, and 5.1%, respectively) by those whose quit attempt lasted one day or longer. Counseling<sup>19</sup> is most commonly reported by non-daily smokers (13.3%). Self-help materials are most popular among moderate and heavy smokers (20.3%). Male and female moderate to heavy smokers vary markedly in their use of counseling advice and self-help materials. LGBT women who are moderate to heavy smokers are five times as likely to obtain counseling advice (13.4% vs. 2.1%) and five times more likely to use self-help materials (31.5% vs. 4.9%).

Use of smoking cessation groups is similar across the smoking status groups though LGBT women who smoke moderately or heavily are more likely than men to use group therapy (8.3% vs. 1.1%). Use of groups tailored for LGBT persons was reported by only a handful of respondents.

There is little interest in having cessation programs that are especially designed for LGBT persons. Although not tabled, we found that only about 5% of LGBT smokers said if they were to seek outside help they would want to go to a program that was at least inclusive of LGBT persons or was designed especially for LGBT persons. As might be expected, more gays, lesbians and bisexuals had an interest in LGBT-specific programs.

Physicians and other health professionals are seen as important interveners with smokers. Overall, 44.5% of LGBT persons who visited a doctor in the last year were advised to quit smoking. The rate is somewhat higher for women than for men (47.1 vs. 40%).

The patterns observed above are also found among the subpopulations of gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women.

---

<sup>19</sup> Counseling includes advice from any counseling professional, such as a therapist or clergy.

**Table 3-7a.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Quit Smoking for One Day or Longer in Past Year Who Used Cessation Aids for Most Recent Quit Attempt**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>
<b>Nicotine Replacement Therapy</b>				
Total	25.0	30.1	22.7	15.7 (+/-1.3)
Non-daily smokers	14.5	17.5	13.0	–
Light daily smokers	22.8	28.1	20.6	–
Moderate-heavy smokers	37.2	38.8	36.0	–
<b>Counseling Advice</b>				
Total	9.5	9.4	9.6	–
Non-daily smokers	13.3	14.9	12.5	–
Light daily smokers	11.3	16.0	9.4	–
Moderate-heavy smokers	8.6	2.1	13.4	–
<b>Self-help Materials</b>				
Total	13.2	9.0	15.2	–
Non-daily smokers	13.0	6.5	16.3	–
Light daily smokers	12.6	11.2	13.1	–
Moderate-heavy smokers	20.3	4.9	31.5	–
<b>Smoking Cessation Group</b>				
Total	5.1	5.7	4.9	–
Non-daily smokers	8.3	8.8	8.1	–
Light daily smokers	6.0	8.9	4.9	–
Moderate-heavy smokers	5.2	1.1	8.3	–
<b>LGBT Smoking Cessation Group</b>				
Total	–	*	–	–
Non-daily smokers	0.1	*	*	–
Light daily smokers	0.1	*	–	–
Moderate-heavy smokers	*	*	*	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Shaded areas indicate data is not available. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 3-7b.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Quit Smoking for One Day or Longer in Past Year Who Used Cessation Aids for**  
**Most Recent Quit Attempt by Subpopulation**

	<b>Current Smokers</b>			
	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>
<b>Nicotine Replacement Therapy</b>				
Total	34.1	28.6	*	18.2
Non-daily smokers	19.1	13.4	*	12.8
Light daily smokers	29.5	25.2	*	17.4
Moderate-heavy smokers	55.8	58.0	*	18.4
<b>Counseling Advice</b>				
Total	11.0	11.8	*	7.9
Non-daily smokers	16.3	19.5	*	9.6
Light daily smokers	17.3	12.1	*	7.6
Moderate-heavy smokers	3.0	20.1	*	8.0
<b>Self-help Materials</b>				
Total	10.4	18.3	*	12.9
Non-daily smokers	7.0	28.2	*	11.4
Light daily smokers	12.0	16.3	*	10.9
Moderate-heavy smokers	7.1	42.0	*	23.1
<b>Smoking Cessation Group</b>				
Total	6.7	9.6	*	1.3
Non-daily smokers	9.6	18.5	*	3.8
Light daily smokers	9.6	8.8	*	2.1
Moderate-heavy smokers	1.5	18.6	*	—
<b>LGBT Smoking Cessation Group</b>				
Total	*	*	*	*
Non-daily smokers	*	*	*	*
Light daily smokers	*	*	*	*
Moderate-heavy smokers	*	*	*	*

\* Suppressed due to small number. — Zero cases or data is not available. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 3-7c.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Attempted to Quit in Last 12 Months Who Used Nicotine Replacement Therapy**  
**for Most Recent Quit Attempt by Demographic Groups**

	Current Smokers			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	CTS Overall
	%	%	%	%
<b>Total</b>	25.0	–	–	15.7 (+/-1.3)
Men	–	30.1	–	14.6
Women	–	–	22.7	17.6
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	12.3	13.4	12.0	6.8
25-44	29.1	31.0	28.4	16.5
45-64	29.4	40.5	19.5	22.1
65+	31.9	*	42.8	19.6
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	32.3	38.8	28.6	21.2
Hispanic	10.7	7.7	12.3	5.4
All others	14.5	2.7	17.0	–
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	37.2	57.2	31.1	10.7
High school graduate	15.2	3.0	20.8	17.7
Some college	25.5	38.1	22.0	18.3
College grad or higher	28.8	36.5	21.6	14.5
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	19.4	6.2	24.7	9.3
\$10K-\$19,999K	18.4	17.8	18.6	11.5
\$20K-\$29,999K	15.6	30.6	12.4	12.8
\$30K-\$49,999K	40.5	36.6	41.8	17.4
\$50K-\$74,999K	13.1	16.5	10.8	21.3
>\$75K	45.1	61.0	33.7	17.5
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	31.2	45.4	19.2	–
Orange/San Diego	13.9	12.4	15.2	–
Inland Empire	9.9	33.0	–	–
Central Coast	18.1	*	*	–
Central Valley	34.2	*	38.1	–
San Francisco Bay Area	28.5	35.6	25.6	–
North Coast/Sierra	23.4	*	25.0	–

(continued next page)

**Table 3-7c. (continued)**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Attempted to Quit in Last 12 Months Who Used Nicotine Replacement Therapy for Most Recent Quit Attempt by Demographic Groups**

	Current Smokers			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	CTS Overall
	%	%	%	%
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	38.5	43.9	27.8	–
Medium density	28.5	32.4	23.7	–
Lower density	23.8	27.6	22.4	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	34.9	44.4	28.7	–
Neither agree nor disagree	17.4	11.9	19.5	–
Disagree	16.1	10.3	18.1	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Shaded areas indicate data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 3-7d.**  
**Former Smokers Who Quit for 12 Months or More Using Nicotine Replacement Therapy**

	Former Smokers		
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
<b>Nicotine Replacement Therapy</b>			
Total	10.3	9.9	10.7

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 3-8a.**  
**LGBT Smokers Advised by Physician or Health Professional to Quit<sup>^</sup>**

	Current Smokers			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	CTS Overall
	%	%	%	%
<b>Total</b>	44.5	–	–	57.2
Men	–	40.0	–	54.7
Women	–	–	47.1	60.3

\* Suppressed due to small number. <sup>^</sup> Among those smokers who saw a health professional in the last year. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.



**Table 3-8b.**  
**LGBT Smokers Advised by Physician or Health Professional to Quit**  
**by Subpopulation and Smoking Status**

	Current Smokers <sup>^</sup>					
	Gay/ Bisexual Men	Lesbian/ Bisexual Women	Other LGBT Men	Other LGBT Women	CTS Men	CTS Women
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Total</b>	41.3	50.8	35.1	44.0	54.7	60.3
Non-daily smokers	32.0	44.1	17.7	23.2	–	–
Light daily smokers	36.0	49.6	33.8	35.7	–	–
Moderate smokers	51.0	46.2	*	68.2	–	–
Heavy smokers	45.3	75.8	*	*	–	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. ^ Among those smokers who saw a health professional in the last year. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

### 3.5 Beliefs About Smoking and Quitting Among the Overall LGBT Population

All respondents were asked whether they agree that nonsmokers are more attractive to them than smokers. Two out of three (66.6%) LGBT adults agreed, including 53.5% who agreed strongly. There were few differences by gender or subpopulation.

One of the popularly held notions about smoking cessation is that the quitter will gain weight. Seven out of ten LGBT persons agreed with this statement (77.2%). There is little difference in this finding between LGBT men and women, or the LGBT subpopulations.

**Table 3-9a.**  
**Agreement that “Nonsmokers are more attractive to you than smokers”**

	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
<b>Agree (net)</b>	66.6	64.9	67.8
Strongly agree	53.5	52.6	54.1
Somewhat agree	13.1	12.3	13.7
<b>Disagree (net)</b>	28.6	28.3	28.8
Somewhat disagree	12.3	14.9	10.5
Strongly disagree	16.3	13.4	18.3
DK/Ref	4.8	6.8	3.4

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 3-9b.</b> <b>Agreement that “Nonsmokers are more attractive to you than smokers” by Subpopulation</b>				
	Gay/Bisexual Men	Lesbian/Bisexual Women	Other LGBT Men	Other LGBT Women
	%	%	%	%
<b>Agree (net)</b>	65.2	76.4	63.6	59.0
Strongly agree	51.9	61.0	54.3	47.0
Somewhat agree	13.3	15.4	9.3	12.0
<b>Disagree (net)</b>	28.9	21.2	26.8	36.7
Somewhat disagree	14.9	9.8	15.0	11.2
Strongly disagree	14.0	11.4	11.8	25.5
DK/Ref	5.9	2.5	9.5	4.3

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 3-10a.</b> <b>Agreement that “Someone who quits smoking will probably gain weight”</b>			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
<b>Agree (net)</b>	72.2	69.1	74.5
Strongly agree	38.8	35.4	41.3
Somewhat agree	33.4	33.7	33.2
<b>Disagree (net)</b>	23.3	25.3	21.8
Somewhat disagree	14.7	14.4	14.9
Strongly disagree	8.6	10.9	6.9
DK/Ref	4.5	5.5	3.8

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 3-10b.</b> <b>Agreement that “Someone who quits smoking will probably gain weight” by Subpopulation</b>				
	Gay/Bisexual Men	Lesbian/Bisexual Women	Other LGBT Men	Other LGBT Women
	%	%	%	%
<b>Agree (net)</b>	69.8	77.6	67.0	71.1
Strongly agree	35.1	41.4	36.3	41.1
Somewhat agree	34.7	36.2	30.7	30.0
<b>Disagree (net)</b>	24.9	18.6	26.6	25.1
Somewhat disagree	15.4	12.8	11.6	17.0
Strongly disagree	9.5	5.8	15.0	8.1
DK/Ref	5.3	3.8	6.3	3.7

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 3.6 Likelihood of Not Quitting Among Current Smokers

Following CTS, the LGBT Tobacco Survey developed a measure of people who are not likely to quit based on behavior (had not stopped smoking for one day or longer in the last year) and attitude (did not agree that they would like to stop smoking). Such a measure is interesting in its own right as well as being an indicator to measure change over time. Changing the hearts and minds of those who neither attempt nor want to quit is the greatest remaining challenge to California's anti-smoking agenda. Declines in that number would be evidence of significant accomplishment.

For LGBT smokers overall, LGBT men and women smokers separately, and smokers in the LGBT subpopulations, the percentage who seem less likely to quit given the above definition is about 40%. Those who seem most likely to quit are light non-daily smokers as only 35.4% have neither tried to quit and do not believe they will quit. Heavy smokers seem least likely to quit as 60.9% have neither attempted to quit in the last year and report they do not want to stop smoking. Again, the greatest concern is focused on LGBT women who smoke heavily. Over 70% seem unlikely to quit.

**Table 3-11a.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Seem Less Likely to Quit by Consumption Level**  
**Current Smokers**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	43.2	47.7	40.5
Light smoker (net)	42.6	48.9	39.3
Light non-daily	35.4	38.3	33.6
Light daily	43.2	50.5	39.4
Moderate smoker	39.7	44.8	36.0
Heavy smoker	60.9	48.9	71.5

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 3-11b.**  
**LGBT Smokers Who Seem Less Likely to Quit by Consumption Level and Subpopulation**  
**Current Smokers**

	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	39.9	38.7	71.1	41.9
Light smoker (net)	40.7	40.6	85.3	38.3
Light non-daily	25.7	38.5	83.2	31.4
Light daily	42.3	40.6	85.3	38.5
Moderate smoker	30.2	19.1	60.9	44.2
Heavy smoker	52.6	*	*	*

\* Suppressed due to small number. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 3.7 Likelihood of Relapse by Former Smokers

Self-assessment of likelihood of relapsing into regular smoking by former smokers is very low with only about 2% of LGBT persons overall reporting that it is likely they will do so. There are only small differences in this number among the LGBT men and women and the LGBT subpopulations.

**Table 3-12a.**  
**Former LGBT Smokers Estimation of Likelihood of Smoking Again**

	<b>Former Smokers</b>		
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Likely	1.9	3.3	0.9
Unlikely	96.6	94.6	98.1
DK/Refused/Never a regular smoker	1.5	2.1	1.1

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 3-12b.**  
**Former LGBT Smokers Estimation of Likelihood of Smoking Again by Subpopulation**

	<b>Former Smokers</b>			
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Likely	3.5	0.1	2.7	1.6
Unlikely	93.9	99.8	96.1	96.6
DK/Ref/Never a regular smoker	2.6	0.1	1.2	1.8

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 3.8 Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey

LGBT smokers are more likely than those in the general population to be light smokers (70.2% vs. 61.5%). This is encouraging given the higher smoking prevalence in the LGBT population. In both populations, women are more likely than men to be light smokers.

In comparison to CTS, the greater tendency for LGBT smokers to be light smokers prevails across all age groups. The overall rates may be misleading, though. Among LGBT men and women age 65 and older, there is a big difference in the proportion of light smokers. Only 32.5% of older LGBT men are light smokers compared to 98.7% of LGBT women. The breakdown of CTS data by gender and age are not presented in the published CTS report so direct comparisons are not possible.

With regard to race/ethnicity, non-Hispanic white LGBT smokers are markedly more likely to be light smokers (65.3% vs. 49.3%) than the same smokers in the general population. The difference between Hispanic LGBT persons and Hispanics in the general population, though, is small (85.5% vs. 81.7%).

Among those with less than a high school degree, the proportion of light smokers in the general population is greater than that of the LGBT population (63.9% vs. 55.9%). In each successively higher education level, the percentage of light smokers is always higher for the LGBT population, but the two groups follow the same pattern in that the proportion of light smokers increases with education.

Among smokers in the general population the proportion of light smokers in each income category is fairly constant, ranging from a low of 58.7% to a high of 64.9%. The same is true among LGBT smokers in different income categories where the proportion ranges from 64% to 70.3%. At the highest income level (\$75,000 and higher) the portion of light smokers jumps to 78.8%. This is due primarily to an increase in the number of higher income gay/bisexual men who are light smokers.

The frequency of smokers making quit attempts that last a day or longer is remarkably similar between the LGBT and general populations (62.7% and 62.1%). One noteworthy difference is seen in the lower quit rate for LGBT men who have less than a high school degree (29.5%). Quit attempts lasting a week or longer follow a similar pattern in that quit rates are very similar between the two populations (39.1% and 40.5%) but the rate for LGBT men with less than a high school degree is much lower than that for the general population (13.2% vs. 40.7%).

The frequency of smokers making quit attempts lasting a year or longer is also remarkably similar between the LGBT and general populations (22% and 22%). The few differences that do appear in different income levels do not show a consistent pattern. There are relatively no differences between the LGBT and the general population in regard to the portion of smokers who have smoking restrictions at both home and work. It is about 25% in both populations.

Use of NRT among smokers who attempted to quit in the last 12 months appears to be more popular among the LGBT than the general population (25% vs. 15.7%). This difference is persistent across most of the demographic groups. LGBT persons age 65 or older are much more likely to have used NRT than their general population counterparts (31.9% vs. 19.6%) as are non-Hispanic white LGBT persons (32.3% vs. 21.2%). Again, LGBT persons with less than a high school degree are much more likely to have used NRT than their general population counterparts (37.2% vs. 10.7%).

Finally, and importantly, just under 45% of LGBT persons who visited a health professional in the last year were advised to quit. In the general population, this percentage is much higher, 57.2%. In both populations women are more likely to be advised to quit than men; however, for both men and women the percentage of the general population receiving interventions is higher.

### 3.9 Comparisons with Other Published LGBT Studies

Overall, little comparable cessation data exist in the published literature. On one issue other data are available: the proportion of the population reporting former-smoker status. On this item, our survey found a lower estimate of cessation among LGBT females than the only prior report. Whereas 27.8% of LGBT women in our study said that they were former smokers (25.5% of lesbian/bisexuals and 30.1% of other LGBT women), 34% of self-identified lesbians in the other study said that they were former smokers. (This study was directed by Cochran and combined data from seven large surveys.)

In terms of the male data, our estimate that 27.8% of LGBT men are former smokers matches that found in the only other household-based survey of men who have sex with men (27%) (Greenwood, 1999). Our survey found, however, that cessation rates differed between gay/bisexual (25.8%) and other LGBT males (34.8%).

<b>Table 3-13.</b> <b>Comparison of 2003 California LGBT Survey Data on Smoking Cessation with Data from Other LGBT Published Studies</b>		
<b>Cessation</b>	<b>Other LGBT Published Studies</b>	<b>2003 CA LGBT Tobacco Survey</b>
LGBT Women	Cochran (1987-96): • 34% L*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27.8% LGBT women</li> <li>• 25.5% LB</li> <li>• 29.7% Other LGBT</li> </ul>
LGBT Men	Greenwood (1999): • 27.0% GB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27.4% LGBT men</li> <li>• 25.0% GB</li> <li>• 31.2% Other LGBT</li> </ul>

\* L = self-identified lesbians; G = Self-identified gay men.

## 4 Secondhand Smoke Exposure

In this section we report on data related to smoking restrictions and levels of exposure to SHS. When comparable published CTS data are available they are also displayed. A discussion of the similarities and differences between the LGBT and general populations is included in the last portion of the section.

## 4.1 Incidence of Smoke-free Workplaces

LGBT respondents were asked a series of questions to establish whether they worked indoors. Tables in Section 4.1 and 4.2 are based on those LGBT men and women who report working indoors. These respondents were asked if the building they worked in was completely smoke-free indoors, and these findings are reported in Section 4.1. They were also asked if, during the past two weeks, anyone had smoked in the area where they worked. These findings are reported in Section 4.2.

A very large majority of LGBT men and women reported working in smoke-free workplaces (96.6% overall). Groups for whom it is below 90% include LGBT women with less than a high school degree (88.4%), LGBT men and women with household incomes between \$10,000 and \$20,000 (85% and 87.8%, respectively), and LGBT women in the North Coast and Sierra areas (89.7%).

Considering the LGBT subpopulations,<sup>20</sup> the proportion of smoke-free workplaces is uniformly very high. As mentioned in earlier sections, the findings for other LGBT men are somewhat different than findings for the other subpopulations. Other LGBT men have the lowest overall rate, 92.3%, and this declines to 76.5% for those with some college education. In addition, the proportion drops below 90% for other LGBT women with lower incomes, particularly those living in the Central Valley area.

<b>Table 4-1a.</b> <b>Indoor LGBT Workers Reporting Smoke-free Workplace</b>				
	<b>Indoor Workers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	96.6 (±1.5)	–	–	95.4 (±0.8)
Men	–	96.3 (±2.7)	–	93.9 (±1.5)
Women	–	–	96.7 (±1.9)	97.1 (±0.7)
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	96.0	99.0	93.8	95.0
25-44	97.5	96.6	98.1	95.6
45-64	95.0	94.3	95.5	95.3
65+	100.0	100.0	*	96.7
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	95.9	95.2	96.4	96.4
Hispanic	99.3	99.0	99.6	93.7
All others	97.1	99.0	95.6	–
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	89.8	92.8	88.4	91.9
High school graduate	96.5	98.4	94.9	92.3
Some college	95.5	93.4	96.6	95.6
College grad or higher	97.7	97.5	97.8	98.3

(continued next page)

<sup>20</sup> The four major subpopulations reported on are gay/bisexual men, lesbian/bisexual women, other LGBT men, and other LGBT women.

**Table 4-1a. (continued)**  
**Indoor LGBT Workers Reporting Smoke-free Workplace**  
**Indoor Workers**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	86.9	*	96.2	95.3
\$10K-\$19,999K	86.9	85.0	87.8	90.2
\$20K-\$29,999K	98.8	95.9	99.8	93.0
\$30K-\$49,999K	97.2	97.8	96.9	94.6
\$50K-\$74,999K	99.4	98.8	99.8	96.5
>\$75K	96.9	96.7	97.0	97.1
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	99.2	99.3	99.1	—
Orange/San Diego	97.7	95.7	99.6	—
Inland Empire	98.1	96.1	100.0	—
Central Coast	100.0	*	100.0	—
Central Valley	95.3	94.3	95.7	—
San Francisco Bay Area	94.2	94.4	94.1	—
North Coast/Sierra	90.8	*	89.7	—
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	94.8	95.3	93.5	—
Medium density	95.2	94.9	95.5	—
Lower density	97.0	96.9	97.0	—
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	95.7	96.1	95.3	—
Neither agree nor disagree	97.8	99.9	96.6	—
Disagree	97.0	94.8	98.0	—

\* Suppressed due to small number. — Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 4-1b.**  
**Indoor LGBT Workers Reporting Smoke-free Workplace**  
**by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Indoor Workers</b>				<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	97.3 (±2.3)	97.7 (±1.3)	92.3 (±10.5)	95.4 (±3.5)	95.4 (±0.8)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	99.7	94.0	*	93.5	95.0
25-44	98.7	98.8	90.7	97.2	95.6
45-64	93.8	97.5	96.9	92.7	95.3
65+	100.0	*	*	*	96.7

(continued next page)

**Table 4-1b. (continued)**  
**Indoor LGBT Workers Reporting Smoke-free Workplace**  
**by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Indoor Workers</b>				<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	96.4	97.1	89.7	95.5	96.4
Hispanic	99.4	99.4	97.1	99.8	93.7
All others	99.4	98.8	98.0	93.0	
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	*	*	*	*	91.9
High school graduate	98.0	94.6	99.4	95.1	92.3
Some college	97.5	97.1	76.5	95.9	95.6
College grad or higher	96.9	98.5	100.0	96.9	98.3
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	*	*	*	*	95.3
\$10K-\$19,999K	95.6	92.7	*	83.7	90.2
\$20K-\$29,999K	95.5	99.9	*	99.8	93.0
\$30K-\$49,999K	98.8	94.4	91.6	99.9	94.6
\$50K-\$74,999K	99.0	99.7	98.3	100.0	96.5
>\$75K	97.6	98.4	93.1	95.0	97.1
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	99.2	100.0	100.0	97.8	–
Orange/San Diego	100.0	99.2	81.2	100.0	–
Inland Empire	94.7	100.0	*	*	–
Central Coast	*	*	*	100.0	–
Central Valley	100.0	100.0	*	89.4	–
San Francisco Bay Area	93.6	96.0	98.4	91.0	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	*	*	*	–
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	95.8	92.5	83.6	96.2	–
Medium density	96.0	96.3	81.8	93.6	–
Lower density	98.1	98.3	93.4	95.6	–
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers</b>					
Most or all know	98.2	95.7	NA	NA	–
Some know	96.2	99.3	NA	NA	–
None know	*	*	NA	NA	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	96.3	97.3	90.9	87.2	–
Neither agree nor disagree	99.8	97.3	100.0	95.8	–
Disagree	98.9	98.7	91.0	97.6	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. NA Not asked. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.



## 4.2 Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in the Workplace for LGBT Subpopulations and Demographic Groups

### 4.2.1 Exposure by LGBT Subpopulations and Demographic Groups

Exposure to SHS in the workplace is reported by just over one in ten LGBT men and women (12.5%). The overall rate is somewhat misleading as there are large differences between various segments within the LGBT population. One out of five LGBT women who are Hispanic or of a race/ethnicity other than white reported exposure to SHS in their work area in the last two weeks (21% and 22.3%). While exposure is generally higher for those with household incomes under \$29,999, rates for LGBT women in these categories are the highest, ranging from 26.7% to 32.5%. One group of men has an exceeding high rate, LGBT men with less than a high school degree at 65.8%.

Exposure also varies substantially by area of the state. The lowest levels of exposure are found for Los Angeles and San Francisco (8.8% and 9.3%). Much higher exposure rates are found for the Inland Empire and North Coast/Sierra regions (28.7% and 41.2%).

**Table 4-2.**  
**Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the**  
**Past Two Weeks by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Indoor Workers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	12.5			12.0 (±1.0)
Men	–	11.5	–	13.3
Women	–	–	13.1	10.6
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	26.8	19.1	31.9	22.5
25-44	10.1	8.6	11.0	12.5
45-64	9.7	13.1	7.0	6.8
65+	1.1	2.0	*	3.0
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	10.6	12.4	9.4	10.4
Hispanic	13.8	5.2	21.0	15.6
All others	17.5	11.5	22.3	–
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	35.7	65.8	21.9	16.1
High school graduate	13.8	8.2	19.2	11.7
Some college	12.1	9.3	13.5	13.0
College grad or higher	11.1	11.6	10.8	8.5
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	22.8	*	26.7	12.2
\$10K-\$19,999K	20.5	0.4	29.7	19.8
\$20K-\$29,999K	29.4	19.1	32.5	16.8
\$30K-\$49,999K	10.6	16.3	7.4	12.8
\$50K-\$74,999K	8.5	14.8	3.6	10.5
>\$75K	10.3	10.3	10.3	9.8

(continued next page)

**Table 4-2. (continued)**  
**Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the**  
**Past Two Weeks by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Indoor Workers</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	8.8	10.3	7.2	–
Orange/San Diego	14.5	15.2	13.9	–
Inland Empire	28.7	38.9	20.6	–
Central Coast	11.7	*	14.7	–
Central Valley	12.0	6.5	14.2	–
San Francisco Bay Area	9.3	8.4	9.9	–
North Coast/Sierra	41.2	*	41.6	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	8.9	7.8	11.5	–
Medium density	12.4	11.3	13.5	–
Lower density	12.8	12.3	13.1	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	11.4	9.8	13.1	–
Neither agree nor disagree	13.0	10.5	14.4	–
Disagree	13.7	16.0	12.7	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 4.2.2 Exposure By Smoking Status

Analysis of exposure by smoking status did reveal noteworthy differences but not those we expected. It had been thought that current smokers might experience more exposure because they themselves smoked. While the rate of exposure is slightly above average for smokers (14.8%), the highest rates are reported by former smokers (17.8%) and the lowest by those who never smoked (7.7%). It appears that former LGBT smokers are much more sensitive to others smoking than current or never-smokers. Among former LGBT smokers, lesbian/bisexual women do not seem to share this sensitivity and report a relatively low exposure rate of 8.6%.

**Table 4-3.**  
**Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the**  
**Past Two Weeks by Smoking Status by LGBT Subpopulation**

	<b>Indoor Workers</b>				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>	<b>Nonsmokers</b>	<b>Former Smokers</b>	<b>Never Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
LGBT Overall	12.5	14.8	11.6	17.8	7.7
LGBT Men	11.5	12.2	11.3	22.6	5.6
LGBT Women	13.1	16.2	11.9	15.0	9.5
Gay/Bisexual Men	11.6	15.4	10.5	22.5	5.8
Lesbian/Bisexual Women	10.2	15.1	8.7	8.6	8.8
Other LGBT Men	11.3	2.1	15.4	22.9	3.9
Other LGBT Women	16.8	17.1	16.6	22.8	10.8

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 4.2.3 Exposure by Type of Workplace

Women who work in restaurants/bars and hospitals/retirement homes/clinics are exposed at over three times the rate as women working in other venues. Exposure for LGBT women working in restaurants/bars is 41.5% and in hospitals/retirement homes/clinics is 30.4%. The rate of exposure in other types of workplaces is also high (20.7%). Among the subpopulations, the rate of exposure reaches a high of 56.4% for lesbian/bisexual women working in hospitals, retirement homes, or clinics.

**Table 4-4a.**  
**Exposure of Indoor Workers to**  
**Secondhand Smoke in the Past Two Weeks by Type of Workplace**

	<b>Indoor Workers</b>		
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	12.1	10.1	13.5
Office	10.0	8.0	11.4
Plant or Factory	0.2	*	0.3
Store or Warehouse	10.9	12.0	9.8
Classroom	15.6	8.5	18.0
Restaurant or Bar	27.3	18.8	41.5
Vehicle	31.5	*	*
Hospital/Retirement Home/Clinic	27.1	2.5	30.4
Home/In Private Residences	–	–	–
Salons/Spas	–	–	–
Health Clubs/Fitness Studio	0.2	*	0.3
Other	16.6	4.4	20.7

\* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 4-4b.**  
**Exposure of Indoor Workers to Secondhand Smoke in the**  
**Past Two Weeks by Type of Workplace by LGBT Subpopulation**

	Indoor Workers			
	Gay/ Bisexual Men	Lesbian/Bisexual Women	Other Men	Other Women
	%	%	%	%
<b>Total</b>	10.4	10.3	8.9	17.4
Office	7.4	9.4	11.3	13.9
Plant or Factory	*	*	*	*
Store or Warehouse	13.2	3.4	8.7	22.4
Classroom	9.7	2.1	*	36.0
Restaurant or Bar	22.0	38.0	*	44.1
Vehicle	*	*	*	*
Hospital/Retirement Home/Clinic	2.6	56.4	*	8.8
Home/In Private Residences	*	*	*	*
Salons/Spas	*	*	*	*
Health Clubs/Fitness Studio	*	*	*	*
Other	4.5	42.8	*	5.4

\* Suppressed due to small number. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 4.3 Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in LGBT Homes

### 4.3.1 LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions

About seven out of ten LGBT persons reported that smoking is completely prohibited in their households (67.9%). This level is fairly consistent across all the population segments, although there are some notable exceptions. Only about half (51.1%) of LGBT men age 18 to 24 report household bans on smoking. About half of the LGBT men with less than a high school degree have smoking bans (49.7%). Hispanic LGBT men also report a low rate at 54.8%. Regions vary by about 15%, from a low of 60.7% in Los Angeles to a high of 75.3% in the Central Coast area.

Considering the LGBT subpopulations, gay/bisexual men ages 65 and older are relatively relaxed about smoking in the household with only about half having total smoking bans (53.8%). This is in contrast to the higher than average rate of bans found for other subpopulations in this age group.

The very low rate (46.9%) of household smoking bans among Hispanic gay/bisexual men is contributing to the overall low rate for gay/bisexual men as are the low rates for those with a high school degree (55%) or less than high school degree (53.4%) and those in the two lower household income categories (46.2% and 37%). Gay/bisexual men with household incomes between \$10,000 and \$19,999 have the lowest rate of 37%. Region is also a factor. Gay/bisexual men in the Los Angeles area have a relatively low rate of 54.3% compared to, for example, San Francisco, where the rate is 66.5%.

**Table 4-5a.**  
**LGBT Homes that Report Total Bans on Smoking by Demographic Groups**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS 2002</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	67.9 (±3.1)	–	–	76.9 (±0.9)
Men	–	66.7 (±4.7)	–	74.6 (±1.4)
Women	–	–	68.8 (±4.0)	79.1 (±1.3)
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	62.9	51.1	69.7	68.8
25-44	70.2	72.4	69.0	80.2
45-64	67.3	67.2	67.5	77.0
65+	65.1	62.1	70.2	75.0
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
Non-Hispanic white	67.9	68.7	67.4	76.6
Hispanic	64.9	54.8	72.4	78.1
All others	68.4	65.8	70.4	–
<b>Education</b>				
Less than 12 years	62.8	49.7	68.5	74.9
High school graduate	58.7	57.7	59.3	79.4
Some college	68.7	71.5	67.2	75.2
College grad or higher	71.6	68.3	74.7	80.8
<b>Income</b>				
<\$10K	59.4	57.5	60.5	71.4
\$10K-\$19,999K	59.4	48.3	65.8	74.0
\$20K-\$29,999K	59.3	67.6	55.1	75.4
\$30K-\$49,999K	63.6	63.9	63.5	75.7
\$50K-\$74,999K	73.0	75.8	70.8	77.1
>\$75K	76.2	73.5	78.6	81.4
<b>Region</b>				
Los Angeles	60.7	57.5	63.9	–
Orange/San Diego	69.1	72.2	66.6	–
Inland Empire	80.9	83.5	78.4	–
Central Coast	75.3	72.7	76.0	–
Central Valley	70.0	62.1	73.6	–
San Francisco Bay Area	68.1	69.2	67.4	–
North Coast/Sierra	62.2	63.7	61.6	–
<b>Density Areas</b>				
Higher density	63.1	61.7	66.6	–
Medium density	63.1	55.8	71.3	–
Lower density	69.2	70.4	68.5	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>				
Agree	65.5	60.7	70.1	–
Neither agree nor disagree	73.0	79.1	69.5	–
Disagree	68.4	69.9	67.7	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 4-5b.**  
**LGBT Homes that Report Total Bans on Smoking**  
**by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS 2002</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	63.8 (±6.1)	73.1 (±5.9)	75.0 (±7.3)	64.3 (±5.5)	76.9 (±0.9)
<b>Age</b>					
18-24	52.1	72.4	*	65.5	68.8
25-44	70.3	70.9	77.7	66.9	80.2
45-64	63.8	77.7	80.2	58.0	77.0
65+	53.8	71.9	70.9	69.6	75.0
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
Non-Hispanic white	65.8	71.7	77.9	62.8	76.6
Hispanic	46.9	75.4	79.2	68.2	78.1
All others	65.9	78.8	65.4	64.9	–
<b>Education</b>					
Less than 12 years	53.4	83.7	44.8	58.2	74.9
High school graduate	55.0	59.4	63.4	59.3	79.4
Some college	68.0	66.9	84.1	67.6	75.2
College grad or higher	64.3	81.4	80.6	66.0	80.8
<b>Income</b>					
<\$10K	46.2	51.1	73.6	65.9	71.4
\$10K-\$19,999K	37.0	70.8	72.1	61.9	74.0
\$20K-\$29,999K	64.9	61.5	75.5	50.2	75.4
\$30K-\$49,999K	63.4	74.6	65.5	51.5	75.7
\$50K-\$74,999K	71.9	66.6	83.9	76.4	77.1
>\$75K	74.4	82.9	70.2	72.7	81.4
<b>Region</b>					
Los Angeles	54.3	70.3	70.7	57.1	–
Orange/San Diego	75.1	58.9	63.0	72.8	–
Inland Empire	82.9	85.4	*	68.6	–
Central Coast	*	82.5	*	72.4	–
Central Valley	54.6	79.9	73.4	67.3	–
San Francisco Bay Area	66.5	73.0	77.7	60.0	–
North Coast/Sierra	*	66.3	*	58.0	–
<b>Density Areas</b>					
Higher density	62.4	72.0	51.0	53.8	–
Medium density	58.4	68.7	35.3	76.5	–
Lower density	66.0	74.1	79.5	63.4	–

(continued next page)

**Table 4-5b. (continued)**  
**LGBT Homes that Report Total Bans on Smoking**  
**by LGBT Subpopulation and Demographic Groups**

	<b>Gay/ Bisexual Men</b>	<b>Lesbian/ Bisexual Women</b>	<b>Other LGBT Men</b>	<b>Other LGBT Women</b>	<b>CTS 2002</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Disclosure of Gay/Lesbian/Bi Orientation to Friends, Family, and Coworkers</b>					
Most or all know	64.9	74.5	NA	NA	–
Some know	62.1	72.2	NA	NA	–
None know	*	*	NA	NA	–
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>					
Agree	60.6	74.2	63.9	55.4	–
Neither agree nor disagree	78.6	71.8	81.2	67.0	–
Disagree	60.8	72.0	76.0	65.9	–

\* Suppressed due to small number. NA Not asked. – Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

### 4.3.2 LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions By Smoking Status

Smoking bans in homes without smokers is an important indicator of the public sentiment toward smoking. It is also important, though, to look at home smoking restrictions in homes where there are smokers. The frequency of smoking bans in LGBT smokers' homes (47.2%) is below the average for LGBT adults (67.9%) as well as below that of nonsmokers (77.2%).

**Table 4-6.**  
**LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Smoking Status**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>Current Smokers</b>	<b>Nonsmokers</b>	<b>CTS- Overall</b>	<b>CTS- Smokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Smoking is completely prohibited	67.9 (±3.1)	47.2	77.2	76.9 (±0.9)	49.0
Smoking is generally prohibited, with few exceptions	12.5	13.8	11.9	13.4	27.3
Smoking is allowed in some rooms only	5.7	11.8	3.0		
There are no restrictions on smoking	12.8	26.0	6.8	11.6	23.7
Other	0.9	1.0	0.9	–	–
DK/Refused	0.2	0.1	0.2	–	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

### 4.3.3 LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Presence of Smoker(s) and Presence of Children

Smoking in homes with children is particularly problematic due to the deleterious effects smoking may have on the children's well-being. Among those LGBT households where there is at least one smoker and one child, 63.1% have total smoking bans. This approaches the rate for LGBT households on average (67.9%). It is well below the 78% level found for LGBT non-smoking households with children, though. To the extent that a more general prohibition may serve to protect children, the combined rate for complete as well as general prohibitions reaches 75.6%.

**Table 4-7.**  
**LGBT Home Smoking Restrictions by Presence of a Child**

	Smoker in the Household		No Smoker in the Household	
	Child in HH	No Child in HH	Child in HH	No Child in HH
	%	%	%	%
Smoking is completely prohibited	63.1	48.8	78.0	79.3
Smoking is generally prohibited, with few exceptions	12.5	13.8	13.5	11.4
Smoking is allowed in some rooms only	9.9	10.2	2.8	2.2
There are no restrictions on smoking	14.4	25.8	5.0	5.8
Other	0.1	1.1	–	1.3
DK/Refused	–	0.3	0.7	–

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

#### 4.4 Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in Places Other Than Home and Work

Almost two out of five LGBT men and women reported that they are often exposed to SHS in places other than work or home (39.6%). This happens a bit more often for LGBT smokers (45.7%) than nonsmokers (36.8%).

**Table 4-8.**  
**Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in Places Other Than Home and Work by Smoking Status**

	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women	Current Smokers	Nonsmokers
	%	%	%	%	%
Exposed to secondhand smoke outside of home and work	39.6 (±3.2)	38.0 (±5.0)	40.7 (±4.3)	45.7	36.8
Not exposed to secondhand smoke outside of home and work	60.1	61.4	59.2	53.8	63.0
DK/Refused	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.5	0.2

Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

#### 4.5 Length of Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in All Locations Last Week

Among nonsmokers, over one in ten (14.2%) were exposed to SHS for an hour or longer in the preceding week. Given findings presented earlier, this could be disproportionately affecting LGBT women.



**Table 4-9.**  
**Length of Exposure to Secondhand Smoke in All Locations Last Week by Smoking Status**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Current Smokers</b>	<b>LGBT Nonsmokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
No exposure at all	30.0	18.8	35.0
1-9 minutes	29.4	19.0	34.1
10-29 minutes	12.2	16.2	10.5
30-59 minutes	6.9	9.1	5.9
1 or more hours last week (net)	21.1	36.6	14.2
1-3 hours	10.4	12.0	9.7
More than 3 hours	10.7	24.6	4.5
DK/Refused	0.4	0.3	0.4

Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 4.6 Beliefs About Secondhand Smoke

Support for smoking bans rests on the public's belief that SHS is harmful to nonsmokers, so harmful, in fact, that it can cause lung cancer and other diseases. While this belief is pervasive, it is not held by all. Just over one in five smokers (22%) and one in ten nonsmokers (7.3%) disagree that cigarette smoke causes lung cancer in nonsmokers. There is substantial uncertainty on this point, though; 8.8% of LGBT adults report that they were uncertain if this was true.

**Table 4-10.**  
**Agreement that "Inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette causes lung cancer in a nonsmoker"**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Current Smokers</b>	<b>LGBT Nonsmokers</b>	<b>CTS-Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Agree that cigarette smoke causes lung cancer in nonsmokers	79.3	65.1	85.6	72.1
Disagree that cigarette smoke causes lung cancer in nonsmokers	11.9	22.0	7.3	–
DK/Refused	8.8	12.9	7.0	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

Beliefs concerning the harmful effects of SHS on children and babies is near universal; 94.5% of LGBT men and women agree with this and another 2.3% are uncertain.

**Table 4-11.**  
**Agreement that "Inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette harms the health of babies and children"**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Current Smokers</b>	<b>LGBT Nonsmokers</b>	<b>CTS-Overall</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Agree that cigarette smoke harms the health of babies and children	94.5	92.4	95.4	90.9
Disagree that cigarette smoke harms the health of babies and children	3.2	4.7	2.5	–
DK/Refused	2.3	2.9	2.1	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

Three out of five LGBT smokers reported that they rarely smoke when they are the only smoker in a group (60.7%). LGBT women are more likely to feel the pressure not to smoke around nonsmokers as 65.9% say they would refrain compared to 51.7% of LGBT men.

**Table 4-12.**  
**Among LGBT Smokers: Agreement that**  
**“I rarely smoke when I am the only smoker in a group”**

	<b>Smokers</b>		
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Agree that rarely smoke when only smoker in group	60.7	51.7	65.9
Disagree that rarely smoke when only smoker in group	38.2	47.1	33.0
DK/Refused	1.1	1.2	1.1

Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

## 4.7 Asserting Nonsmoker Rights

### 4.7.1 LGBT Nonsmokers Annoyance with Smoking

Over half of LGBT nonsmokers find others' smoking to be very or extremely annoying (52.3%) with LGBT women being a little more likely to be annoyed than men (55.9% vs. 47.4%).

**Table 4-13.**  
**LGBT Nonsmoker Annoyance with Smoking**

	<b>Nonsmokers</b>		
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Not annoying at all	8.1	10.2	6.4
Somewhat annoying (net)	38.8	41.2	37.0
A little annoying	18.8	21.7	16.7
Moderately annoying	20.0	19.5	20.3
Very or extremely annoying	52.3	47.4	55.9
Very annoying	18.4	18.1	18.6
Extremely annoying	33.9	29.3	37.3
DK/Refused	0.9	1.2	0.6

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 4.7.2 LGBT Nonsmokers Asking Someone Not to Smoke

As reported in Table 4-14, 42.6% of LGBT nonsmokers have asked someone to stop smoking in the last 12 months. In Table 4-8 it was noted that 36.8% of LGBT nonsmokers reported being exposed to SHS in places other than work or home. This suggests that most nonsmokers feel they are able to exert their right to not breathe SHS. Even 37.4% of LGBT smokers have asked someone else not to smoke though they smoke themselves.

**Table 4-14.**  
**Asked Someone Not to Smoke in Last 12 Months**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Smokers</b>	<b>LGBT Nonsmokers</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Asked someone to stop smoking	41.0	37.4	42.6
Have not asked someone to stop smoking	58.4	62.2	56.7
DK/Refused	0.6	0.4	0.7

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Focusing on the 41% of LGBT nonsmokers who asked someone not to smoke, their main reason for doing so was because the smoke was annoying to them (38.4%). Many asked a friend not to smoke (36.5%) and the most frequently named reason was that the smoke was annoying to them (31.7%). This suggests that activism is neither limited to talking to strangers nor simply a matter of expressing concern for another's well-being. Rather, it has become more widespread and socially acceptable even among intimates.

Nonsmokers' health concerns are in a distant second place after annoyance as a reason to ask someone not to smoke (25% vs. 38.4%).

**Table 4-15.**  
**Of Those Who Asked Someone Not to Smoke, Who Respondent Asked and Why**  
**(Most Recent Occasion)**

	<b>Who Respondent Asked Not to Smoke</b>								
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Spouse or partner</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>Child</b>	<b>Other relative</b>	<b>Friend</b>	<b>Co-worker</b>	<b>Other known person</b>	<b>Stranger/DK/Refused</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	100.0	15.1	2.3	2.9	12.6	36.5	4.5	7.7	18.4
Smoke was annoying you	38.4	41.6	21.4	7.9	40.0	31.7	29.2	48.4	52.8
Nonsmoker health concerns (net)	25.0	21.8	42.3	12.2	19.9	31.7	29.4	25.0	16.9
Concerned about long-term health effects of secondhand smoke	12.6	11.3	18.4	2.0	10.7	17.3	13.7	10.3	7.4
Concerned about your own health (respondent's health)	12.4	10.5	23.9	10.2	9.2	14.4	15.7	14.7	9.5
Concerned about the smoker's health	14.3	21.4	35.0	44.8	26.3	9.7	14.9	11.0	3.7
Because there's no smoking allowed in the household	7.9	2.1	–	14.4	3.8	14.1	0.3	9.9	4.4
Smoking was illegal	3.5	–	0.8	3.3	–	–	12.3	1.7	14.4
Other/DK/Refused	10.8	13.1	0.5	17.3	10.0	12.9	13.9	4.0	7.8

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 4.7.3 How Often Smokers Are Asked Not to Smoke

Over half of smokers have been asked not to smoke in the last 12 months (57.4%). The approximately 10% of LGBT smokers that reported having been asked many times are apparently unmoved by other's requests for them not to smoke. This item may be an indicator of smokers' unreadiness and unwillingness to quit or as a measure of hard core smoking.

**Table 4-16.**  
**How Often LGBT Smokers Were Asked to Not Smoke in the Past 12 Months**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>Smokers LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Never	42.5	45.1	41.0
Ever	57.4	55.0	58.9
Once or twice	33.5	32.0	34.4
Several times	14.4	13.5	14.9
Many times	9.5	9.5	9.6
DK/Refused	0.1	–	0.1

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 4.8 Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey

In regard to the incidence of smoke-free workplaces, the LGBT population mirrors the general population. The rates are nearly equal and follow similar patterns.

As to exposure to SHS, the two populations are also quite similar with two exceptions. LGBT men and women with less than a high school degree are more likely to be exposed (35.7% vs. 16.1%), as are those from households with incomes under \$30,000 (20.5% to 29.4 for LGBT persons compared to 12.2% to 19.8% for the general population).

Total bans on smoking exist in somewhat fewer LGBT households (67.9%) than in the general population (76.9%). This ten percent difference is maintained across the demographic groups with two exceptions. There are over 20% fewer households with smoking bans among LGBT persons with a high school degree than in the same segment of the general population (58.7% vs. 79.4%). There are about 15% fewer LGBT households that have smoking bans in the household income categories under \$30,000 (59.3% to 59.4% for LGBT persons compared to 71.4% to 75.4% for the general population).

When considering smokers' households only, the portion of LGBT households with complete smoking bans is about equal to that of the general population (47.2% compared to 49%). The two populations are also approximately the same in terms of the portion of households with no restrictions on smoking (26% and 23.7%). In terms of beliefs, LGBT persons are only slightly more likely to believe that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette can cause lung cancer in a nonsmoker (79.3% and 72.1%). LGBT persons are also slightly more likely to believe that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette harms the health of babies and children (94.5% and 90.9%).

# 5 Tobacco Advertising and Promotion

## 5.1 Awareness of Media

This section of the report examines the issue of tobacco company advertising and promotion within the California LGBT population. The first table, Table 5-1a, indicates that almost everyone, more than 90% of LGBT adults, have seen cigarette advertising in magazines.

<b>Table 5-1a.</b> <b>Recall of Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Has seen cigarette advertisement in magazine	93.9	93.8	94.0
Has not seen cigarette advertisement in magazine	5.1	5.1	5.0
DK/Refused	1.0	1.2	0.9

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

This very high rate of advertising exposure prevails across all the subpopulations selected for analysis, as Table 5-1b shows:

<b>Table 5-1b.</b> <b>Recall of Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines by Smoking Status</b>												
	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>			<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>			<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>Other LGBT Women</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>NCS<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Has seen cigarette advertisement in magazine	94.5	90.6	96.0	93.3	92.6	93.6	91.5	86.6	93.2	94.8	93.4	95.6
Has not seen cigarette advertisement in magazine	4.5	8.7	2.8	5.1	6.2	4.7	6.8	13.4	4.5	4.9	6.6	3.9
DK/Refused	1.0	0.6	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.7	–	2.2	0.3	–	0.5

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. <sup>+</sup> Not current smoker. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Table 5-2a presents data on brand recall. Marlboro (31.4%) and Camel (20.1%) are the brands most often recalled by respondents who saw these tobacco ads. The Virginia Slims brand ranked a distant third (7%). About one-quarter (26.2%) of the LGBT population could not recall any specific brand associated with the ads they recalled. The percentage of LGBT males (31.5%) unable to recall a brand was higher than the percentage of LGBT females (22.5%).

**Table 5-2a.**  
**Most Recently Advertised Brand:**  
**Among Those Ever Recalling Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
American Spirits	0.1	0.1	0.1
Basic	0.2	–	0.3
Benson and Hedges	0.2	–	0.3
Camel	20.1	17.2	22.1
Capri	0.4	–	0.6
Carlton	0.2	–	0.3
Generic	0.3	–	0.6
Kent	0.1	–	0.2
Kool	4.2	2.0	5.8
Marlboro	31.4	34.8	29.1
Merit	0.3	0.5	0.2
More	–	–	–
Newport	3.4	3.2	3.6
Pall Mall	0.2	–	0.3
Parliament	0.1	0.2	–
Salem	1.5	1.5	1.5
Vantage	–	–	–
Virginia Slims	7.0	3.6	9.5
Winston	2.7	3.9	1.9
Other	0.4	0.6	0.2
None	0.9	0.7	1.1
DK/Refused	26.2	31.5	22.5

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Table 5-2b shows that more gay/bisexual men (29.7%) were unable to recall a specific brand than lesbian/bisexual women (22.3%). More other LGBT men (37%) were unable to recall a brand than other LGBT women (22.7%). Smokers were more able to recall brands from the ads than nonsmokers. Data on the most commonly recalled brands are quite similar to those from the previous table. One difference is that Newport and Winston rank higher in recall among other LGBT men than they do among any of the other subpopulations.

**Table 5-2b.**  
**Most Recently Advertised Brand:**  
**Among Those Ever Recalling Cigarette Advertisements in Magazines by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total	CS^	NCS+	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
American Spirits	0.1	0.2	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	0.1	–	0.2
Basic	–	–	–	0.6	2.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Benson and Hedges	0.1	0.2	–	0.1	–	0.1	–	–	–	0.5	0.1	0.7
Camel	18.9	24.8	16.7	24.1	20.3	25.6	12.4	15.0	11.5	20.1	20.9	19.5
Capri	–	–	–	0.4	1.3	–	–	–	–	0.9	1.2	0.7
Carlton	–	0.1	–	0.1	–	0.1	–	–	–	0.5	1.2	–
Generic	–	–	–	1.1	4.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kent	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.5	–	0.7
Kool	2.7	2.7	2.7	5.3	7.4	4.4	–	–	–	6.3	6.2	6.3
Marlboro	35.3	28.4	37.7	29.8	23.2	32.4	33.5	27.5	35.5	28.3	24.9	30.4
Merit	0.6	2.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.5	1.2	–
More	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	0.2	–
Newport	1.5	0.7	1.8	3.6	6.1	2.6	8.4	28.1	1.9	3.6	5.7	2.3
Pall Mall	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.5	–	0.8
Parliament	0.2	0.4	0.2	–	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Salem	1.3	3.5	0.5	1.4	1.1	1.5	2.0	2.6	1.8	1.6	–	2.6
Vantage	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Virginia Slims	4.2	4.0	4.3	7.8	15.6	4.8	1.7	4.9	0.6	11.1	17.5	7.1
Winston	3.9	6.7	2.8	2.1	1.6	2.3	4.1	15.8	0.2	1.7	3.1	0.8
Other	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.1	0.7	1.5	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1
None	1.0	–	1.3	1.0	–	1.4	–	–	0.1	1.1	1.3	0.9
DK/Refused	29.7	24.9	31.4	22.3	16.3	24.6	37.0	4.6	47.9	22.7	16.5	26.6

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Few respondents (16.3%) recalling ads believed that the ads were specifically designed to appeal to LGBT people, although LGBT males (25.2%) were more likely to believe this than LGBT females (10%). These data are presented in Table 5-3a. Table 5-3b presents the same data for the four study subpopulations and shows that gay/bisexual men (30.9%) are more likely than lesbian/bisexual women (14.3%) to believe that ads were designed to appeal to LGBT people.

**Table 5-3a.**  
**Belief That Advertisements Were Specifically Designed to Appeal to LGBT People:**  
**Among Those Recalling Magazine Advertisements**

	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
Believe designed to appeal to LGBT people	16.3	25.2	10.0
Don't believe designed to appeal to LGBT people	74.9	64.6	82.2
DK/Refused	8.8	10.2	7.8

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 5-3b.**  
**Belief That Advertisements Were Specifically Designed to Appeal to LGBT People:**  
**Among Those Recalling Magazine Advertisements by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total	CS <sup>^</sup>	NCS <sup>+</sup>	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Believe designed to appeal to LGBT people	30.9	31.1	30.8	14.3	16.9	13.3	8.3	2.9	10.0	5.7	7.2	4.7
Don't believe designed to appeal to LGBT people	61.3	64.1	60.3	79.1	81.2	78.3	74.6	96.3	67.3	85.3	88.9	83.2
DK/Refused	7.8	4.8	8.9	6.5	1.9	8.3	17.1	0.8	22.6	9.0	3.9	12.2

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 5.2 Participation in Promotional Activities

Approximately 7% of the overall sample reported receiving free samples of tobacco products. As Table 5-4a indicates, these free samples were rarely received at LGBT identified events or locations. Table 5-4b presents these data for the subpopulations and shows that gay/bisexual men are slightly more likely to have received the free samples than their counterparts. Also, as one would expect, more smokers than nonsmokers have received the free samples.

**Table 5-4a.**  
**Receipt of Free Sample of Tobacco Products**

	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
Received no sample	93.1	92.2	93.8
Received sample	6.7	7.5	6.2
At LGBT- identified event or location	1.2	2.2	0.5
Received sample elsewhere	5.5	5.4	5.6
DK/Refused	–	–	–
DK/Refused if received sample	0.1	0.3	–

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 5-4b.**  
**Receipt of Free Sample of Tobacco Products by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total	CS <sup>^</sup>	NCS <sup>+</sup>	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Received no sample	91.9	88.4	93.2	94.3	88.0	96.7	93.2	89.2	94.6	93.3	87.0	97.4
Received sample	8.1	11.6	6.8	5.7	12.0	3.3	5.7	10.8	3.9	6.7	13.0	2.6
At LGBT- identified event or location	2.9	3.0	2.8	1.0	2.2	0.6	0.1	–	0.2	–	–	0.1
Received sample elsewhere	5.3	8.5	4.0	4.7	9.8	2.7	5.6	10.8	3.7	6.6	12.9	2.6
DK/Refused	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.1	0.2	–
DK/Refused if received sample	–	–	–	–	–	–	1.1	–	1.5	–	–	–

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. + Not current smoker. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.



Table 5-4c presents data on the relationship between age and receipt of free samples. No consistent relationship emerges. Gay/bisexual men and 25-to 40-year-olds (14.2%) are more likely than 41-plus-year-olds (7.1%) and 18-to 25-year-olds (0%) to have received free samples. With other men, the same pattern seems to apply although the differences are small; and, in the case of 18-to 24-year-olds, there are too few for careful analysis. Among lesbian/bisexual women, the difference between the cohorts is quite small but within this subpopulation, 18-to 24-year-olds are most likely (8.4%) to have received the samples. Interestingly, among the other LGBT women, an entirely different pattern applies: the oldest women (aged 41-plus) are most likely to report receiving the free samples (9.5%).

<b>Table 5-4c.</b> <b>Those Who Received a Free Sample of Tobacco Products by Age and Smoking Status</b>												
	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total	CS <sup>^</sup>	NCS <sup>+</sup>	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
18-24-year-olds	–	–	–	8.4	17.4	2.1	*	*	*	4.5	8.1	–
25-40-year-olds	14.2	19.3	11.9	4.4	10.2	1.4	5.2	0.4	7.5	4.0	10.0	0.3
41+ year-olds	7.1	11.0	6.0	5.8	9.5	5.0	3.8	9.2	2.4	9.5	18.1	4.9

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. <sup>+</sup> Not current smoker. \* Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Table 5-5a displays the percentage of LGBT respondents who say that they have purchased or received a branded promotional item in the last year. Overall, 5.8% of survey respondents answered affirmatively. This rate appears to be similar to the rate for the California general population. (For the general population data see Table 5-5c below.) Some LGBT respondents said they got the items from sending in coupons or as part of cigarette purchases (1.3% and 1.2%). Others said they got them as gifts or from events they attended (0.6% and 0.5%).

Table 5-5b shows that, although the differences are not great, lesbian/bisexual women (5.9%) and other LGBT women (8.2%) are slightly more likely than gay/bisexual men (4.8%) and other LGBT men (2.1%) to receive promotional items. Smokers, generally, are more likely than nonsmokers to report receipt of promotional items.

<b>Table 5-5a.</b> <b>Who Obtained Promotional Items With a Brand Name or Logo on it</b> <b>and How They Obtained It</b>			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
Did not obtain Item with logo	93.8	95.6	92.6
Obtained item with logo	5.8	4.1	7.0
Fair, festival, or event	0.5	0.1	0.8
Gift from friend or relative	0.6	0.2	0.8
Received as prize in a game	–	–	–
Received from sending in coupons or parts of tobacco package	1.3	0.4	1.8
As part of a cigarette purchase	1.2	1.9	0.7
Other	2.0	1.4	2.3
DK/Refused where obtained	0.3	0.1	0.5
DK/Refused if obtained item with logo	0.3	0.3	0.4

– Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 5-5b.**  
**Who Obtained Promotional Items With a Brand Name or Logo on it**  
**and How They Obtained it by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total	CS^	NCS+	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Did not obtain Item with logo	95.1	95.1	95.2	93.3	82.6	97.5	97.1	95.3	97.8	91.8	88.6	93.9
Obtained item with logo	4.8	4.9	4.7	5.9	16.7	1.6	2.1	4.7	1.1	8.2	11.4	6.1
Fair, festival, or event	0.2	0.3	0.1	1.2	3.5	0.3	–	–	–	0.4	–	0.7
Gift from friend or relative	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.9	2.5	0.2	–	–	–	0.8	0.2	1.2
Received as prize in a game	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Received from sending in coupons or parts of tobacco package	0.6	0.5	0.6	2.5	7.4	0.5	–	–	–	1.2	3.0	–
As part of a cigarette purchase	2.5	2.0	2.7	0.5	1.7	–	–	–	–	0.9	1.1	0.7
Other	1.2	2.0	0.9	0.9	1.5	0.6	2.1	4.7	1.1	3.8	6.5	2.1
DK/Refused	0.1	0.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1.1	0.6	1.4
DK/Refused if obtained item with logo	0.1	–	0.1	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	–	1.1	–	–	–

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Table 5-5c presents data on promotional item distribution efforts across various age categories. It indicates that 18-to 24-year-old LGBT persons (more than 15% of gay/bisexual male 18-to 24 year-olds as well as lesbian/bisexual female 18-to 24 year olds) are more likely to report receipt of promotional items than their general population counterparts (7.9%). Other LGBT women seem somewhat less likely than gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women, although the difference is not great; and for other LGBT men, there are too few cases to analyze.

**Table 5-5c.**  
**Those who Obtained Promotional Items With a**  
**Brand Name or Logo on it by Age and Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women			CTS 2002
	Total	CS^	NCS+	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
18-24-year-olds	15.5	–	24.4	15.1	27.5	6.3	*	*	*	9.8	13.2	5.5	7.9
25-40-year-olds	2.8	7.0	0.8	6.4	16.7	1.1	4.0	11.5	0.2	8.1	6.9	8.8	6.8
41+ year-olds	2.9	5.6	2.0	1.4	5.3	0.6	0.3	–	0.4	7.9	15.1	4.1	4.2

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Suppressed due to small number. – Zero cases. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

### 5.3 Attitudes Toward Tobacco Company Advertising and Promotions

Overwhelming majorities (two-thirds or more) of all the populations agree that the ban on cigarette advertising should be extended to all media and that tobacco advertising encourages young people to start smoking. There is substantially less support for the idea that LGBT organizations should not accept money from tobacco companies. On this latter issue, only a bare majority of the LGBT population (52.7%) agrees. As Table 5-6b indicates, gay/bisexual men (58%) and lesbian/bisexual women (55%) are more likely to agree than are the other men (46%) and other women (47.2%).

Knowledge about industry targeting of the LGBT market is not very high. Only one third (32.1%) of the LGBT population agreed with a statement that tobacco companies target LGBT people in their advertising and promotional efforts. LGBT men (45%) were far more likely to agree than LGBT women (22.9%). Table 5-6b shows that among subpopulations, gay/bisexual men (51.2%) were more likely to agree than other men (27.1%), lesbian/bisexual women (28.9%) and other women (16.8%). Generally speaking, across all these TI promotional topics, nonsmokers were more likely than smokers to take a pro-tobacco-control stance.

Table 5-6a. Attitudes Toward Tobacco Company Advertising and Promotions			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
Agree that the ban on cigarette advertising should be extended to all media	70.1	63.6	74.6
Agree that tobacco advertising encourages young people to start smoking	78.3	79.1	77.7
Agree that tobacco companies target LGBT people in their advertising and promotional efforts	32.1	45.0	22.9
Agree that LGBT organizations should not accept money from tobacco companies	52.7	54.9	51.2

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 5-6b.</b> <b>Attitudes Toward Tobacco Company Advertising and Promotions by Smoking Status</b>												
	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total %	CS <sup>^</sup> %	NCS+ %	Total %	CS %	NCS %	Total %	CS %	NCS %	Total %	CS %	NCS %
Agree that the ban on cigarette advertising should be extended to all media	64.9	58.9	67.2	72.2	67.6	74.1	60.1	61.2	59.6	77.1	77.3	77.0
Agree that tobacco advertising encourages young people to start smoking	81.8	67.8	87.2	82.7	67.8	88.6	71.3	59.7	75.4	72.5	58.9	81.2
Agree that tobacco companies target LGBT people in their advertising and promotional efforts	51.2	41.1	55.1	28.9	27.6	29.4	27.1	34.4	24.5	16.8	15.3	17.8
Agree that LGBT organizations should not accept money from tobacco companies	58.0	42.8	63.8	55.0	29.3	65.2	46.0	47.3	45.5	47.2	36.5	54.0

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 5.4 Comparison to California Tobacco Survey

There is little comparable published 2002 CTS data available for the general California adult population. Comparable results exist in some areas such as receipt of tobacco promotional items and the brands from recalled tobacco ads. It appears as if about the same proportion of both the LGBT population (5.8%) and general adult population (estimated to be about 6%), have received branded promotional items. LGBT young adults (aged 18-24 years) are more likely to receive these items than their general population counterparts and older LGBT adults (age 25 and over) are somewhat less likely. As with the general population, LGBT adults were most likely to recall Marlboro and Camel branded advertising.

# 6 Tobacco Control Efforts

In Section 6 of the report we assess LGBT population exposure to the California Tobacco Control Program as well as attitudes toward tobacco control issues.

## 6.1 Recall of Anti-tobacco Message Media

As Table 6-1a indicates, about three-quarters of the LGBT population reports exposure to anti-tobacco messages in the last 30 days.

<b>Table 6-1a.</b> <b>Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days: Among Entire Sample</b>			
	LGBT Overall	LGBT Men	LGBT Women
	%	%	%
Recalled some	73.6	71.8	74.9
Do not recall any	23.6	25.5	22.3
DK/Ref	2.8	2.7	2.8

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Younger LGBT persons are more likely than older ones to report exposure (84.5% of 18-to 24-year-olds vs. 47.4% of 65-plus-year-olds). Age differences are greater than the others presented in Table 6-1b. There is some evidence that non-Hispanic whites have a slightly higher rate of exposure (75.9%) than those of other race/ethnicities (66.9% of Hispanics and 68.2% of all other races/ethnicities), and that the rate is slightly higher among more educated LGBT persons (74.8% and 76.1% for some college education and more). Overall, however, the rates are quite high among all the subpopulations except for those aged 65-plus (47.4%) and LGBT men with less than a high school education (53.3%).

<b>Table 6-1b.</b>			
<b>Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days by Gender and Demographic Group</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>			
<b>Age</b>			
18-24	84.5	84.7	84.3
25-44	78.3	76.2	79.5
45-64	68.5	68.6	68.3
65+	47.4	52.3	39.1
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Non-Hispanic white	75.9	74.1	77.0
Hispanic	66.9	69.0	65.4
All others	68.2	59.7	74.5
<b>Education</b>			
Less than 12 years	68.1	53.3	74.6
High school graduate	66.9	71.0	64.2
Some college	74.8	76.1	74.0
College grad or higher	76.1	71.6	80.3
<b>Income</b>			
<\$10K	67.9	65.2	69.6
\$10K-\$19,999K	74.4	70.4	76.7
\$20K-\$29,999K	74.1	81.9	70.1
\$30K-\$49,999K	73.6	67.4	77.0
\$50K-\$74,999K	72.1	73.4	71.1
>\$75K	80.1	78.0	82.0

(continued next page)

**Table 6-1b. (continued)**  
**Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days by Gender and Demographic Group**

	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Region</b>			
LA	74.6	72.4	76.8
Orange/San Diego	68.0	63.4	71.6
Inland Empire	75.5	70.1	80.6
Central Coast	82.9	75.6	84.7
Central Valley	73.7	71.7	74.6
San Francisco Bay Area	72.2	74.3	70.7
North Coast/Sierra	82.6	88.9	80.0
<b>Density Areas</b>			
Higher density	75.6	76.0	74.4
Medium density	70.9	71.5	70.3
Lower density	74.0	71.3	75.6
<b>Feel Part of LGBT Community</b>			
Agree	76.2	73.2	79.2
Neither agree nor disagree	79.5	80.9	78.7
Disagree	70.2	66.9	72.0

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

In terms of the four main subpopulations and smoking status, gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women are somewhat more likely to recall messages than their counterparts (73.8% and 79% respectively, compared to 29.9% of other LGBT men and 25.3% of other LGBT women). In addition, slightly more smokers recall messages than nonsmokers. These data are presented in Table 6-1c.

**Table 6-1c.**  
**Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days: Among Entire Sample by Smoking Status**

	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>			<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>			<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>Other LGBT Women</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>NCS<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Do not recall any	23.9	21.8	24.8	19.3	10.0	23.0	29.9	33.4	28.7	25.3	20.5	28.4
Recalled some	73.8	77.5	72.3	79.0	89.5	74.8	66.2	66.6	66.1	70.7	77.0	66.7
DK/Ref	2.3	0.7	2.9	1.7	0.5	2.1	3.9	–	5.3	4.0	2.5	4.9

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. <sup>+</sup> Not current smoker. – Zero cases. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

Table 6-1d presents data on the relationship between age and anti-tobacco message recall.

<b>Table 6-1d.</b> <b>Recall of Any Anti-Tobacco Messages in Last 30 Days by Age Group</b>														
	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>			<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>			<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>Other LGBT Women</b>			<b>CTS 2002</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS^</b>	<b>NCS+</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Recall a lot</b>	<b>Recall a few</b>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
18-24-year-olds	84.9	95.0	79.1	85.5	87.6	83.9	*	*	*	82.6	79.4	86.6	37.9	47.7
25-40-year-olds	77.5	76.5	77.9	85.5	94.4	80.9	79.5	88.5	75.0	76.7	83.1	72.8	23.2	54.9
41+ year-olds	68.6	70.5	68.0	70.2	82.9	67.5	57.9	43.0	62.0	62.4	69.8	58.5	13.6	49.5

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. \* Suppressed due to small number. Sources: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

Few LGBT persons are seeing anti-tobacco messages in LGBT magazines and newspapers, as the next two tables show. This is not surprising given that many LGBT persons do not regularly read LGBT-identified publications and the large-scale presence of the State's anti-tobacco campaign in general market media. The data in the tables suggest that LGBT men-especially those who identify as gay or bisexual-are somewhat more likely to report seeing the messages in LGBT print outlets.

<b>Table 6-2a.</b> <b>Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Types of Medium Where Messages Were Seen</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	%	%	%
In an LGBT magazine	7.7	13.3	3.8
In an LGBT newspaper	6.9	10.8	4.3
In media directed to everyone	94.0	93.4	94.4

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 6-2b.</b> <b>Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages:</b> <b>Types of Medium Where Messages Were Seen by Smoking Status</b>													
	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>			<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>			<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>Other LGBT Women</b>			
	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS^</b>	<b>NCS+</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
In an LGBT magazine	16.8	23.0	14.3	5.2	2.0	6.8	2.1	0.5	2.7	2.2	3.0	1.7	
In an LGBT newspaper	11.6	9.8	12.3	6.0	5.0	6.4	8.0	0.5	10.8	2.3	1.5	2.9	
In media directed to everyone	94.5	94.2	94.6	95.5	98.2	94.3	90.1	99.5	86.7	93.0	96.3	90.6	

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

In terms of appeal, the majority of study respondents did not find the ads personally appealing (44.3%) and few found them to be appealing to LGBT people (17.5%). These data are presented in Table 6-3a. As the following Table 6-3b shows other LGBT men were least likely to find the ads personally appealing (34.9%) or as appealing to LGBT persons (12.6%).

<b>Table 6-3a.</b> <b>Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Appeal of These Messages</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Message appealing to me	44.3	41.2	46.4
Message appealing to LGBTs	17.5	16.5	18.2

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

<b>Table 6-3b.</b> <b>Among Those Who Recall Anti-Tobacco Messages: Appeal of These Messages by Smoking Status</b>												
	<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>			<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>			<b>Other LGBT Men</b>			<b>Other LGBT Women</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>NCS<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>NCS</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Message appealing to me	43.2	28.3	49.4	45.8	44.9	46.2	34.9	27.8	37.5	47.2	49.4	45.6
Message appealing to LGBTs	17.7	19.7	16.9	19.5	20.3	19.1	12.6	16.0	11.3	16.8	19.7	14.7

<sup>^</sup> Current smoker. <sup>+</sup> Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 6.2 Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation

This portion of Section 6 examines LGBT attitudes toward TI regulation. Data for the overall population and LGBT men and women is presented in Table 6-4a. The display in Table 6-4b presents it for the main subpopulations.

There is overwhelming support (83.5%) for the idea that tobacco companies could lower nicotine content of tobacco products if they wanted. There is also strong majority support (59.6%) for FDA or other government regulation of tobacco products, especially among LGBT nonsmokers. Only about one-quarter of the LGBT population supports banning the production and sale of cigarettes in the U.S. However, as you would expect, support for a ban is higher among nonsmokers than smokers.

<b>Table 6-4a.</b> <b>Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation</b>			
	<b>LGBT Overall</b>	<b>LGBT Men</b>	<b>LGBT Women</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Agree that tobacco companies could lower nicotine content of tobacco products if they wanted	83.5	80.7	85.5
Agree that tobacco products should be regulated by a government agency such as the FDA	59.6	61.2	58.5
Agree that production and sale of cigarettes should not be legally allowed in the United States	24.6	24.3	24.9

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.



**Table 6-4b.**  
**Attitudes Toward Tobacco Industry Regulation by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total %	CS^	NCS+	Total %	CS	NCS	Total %	CS	NCS	Total %	CS	NCS
Agree that tobacco companies could lower nicotine content of tobacco products if they wanted	81.8	82.0	81.7	83.6	80.2	84.9	77.7	81.2	76.4	87.5	88.7	86.8
Agree that tobacco products should be regulated by a government agency such as the FDA	60.5	51.8	63.8	57.3	38.9	64.5	63.1	61.5	63.7	59.7	45.2	68.9
Agree that production and sale of cigarettes should not be legally allowed in the United States	25.7	15.3	29.7	26.6	14.0	31.6	20.1	12.7	22.7	23.2	16.7	27.2

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

### 6.3 Support for Additional Taxes on Cigarettes

There is overwhelming support for an increase in cigarette taxes. About one-third of the LGBT population favors a \$2-plus increase, the biggest option we presented in the interview (31.4%). A majority (52.5%) favors an increase of at least \$1. Gay/bisexual men (57.8%) and lesbian/bisexual women (53.6%) were more likely than the other LGBT men (46.8%) and other LGBT women (47.5%) to be supportive of an increase of at least \$1. Two-thirds (67.1%) of LGBT adults favored an increase of at least \$.50/pack, a greater percentage than the general population (60.7%).

**Table 6-5a.**  
**Amount of Additional Cigarette Taxes to Fund Children's Health Programs**

	LGBT Overall %	LGBT Men %	LGBT Women %	CTS 2002 %
More than \$2 a pack	31.4	33.5	29.9	60.7 (+1.1)
\$2.00 a pack	6.7	7.1	6.4	
\$1.00 a pack	14.4	14.4	14.3	
\$0.75 a pack	4.4	4.5	4.3	
\$0.50 a pack	10.2	8.4	11.5	–
\$0.25 a pack	12.3	11.5	12.9	
None	17.7	16.7	18.3	
DK/Refused	3.0	3.9	2.4	–

– Zero cases or data is not available. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey, CTS 2002.

**Table 6-5b.**  
**Amount of Additional Cigarette Taxes to Fund Children's Health Programs by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women		
	Total %	CS^ %	NCS+ %	Total %	CS %	NCS %	Total %	CS %	NCS %	Total %	CS %	NCS %
More than \$2 a pack	34.5	18.9	40.4	35.1	12.9	43.9	30.8	5.7	39.9	24.6	8.2	35.0
\$2.00 a pack	7.6	3.7	9.1	6.3	1.7	8.2	5.5	0.2	7.4	6.4	3.1	8.5
\$1.00 a pack	15.7	16.9	15.3	12.2	10.5	12.9	10.5	1.3	13.8	16.5	12.8	18.8
\$0.75 a pack	4.9	3.6	5.5	4.1	4.8	3.8	3.4	5.6	2.6	4.5	4.2	4.7
\$0.50 a pack	9.0	12.7	7.6	10.4	14.2	8.9	6.6	5.7	6.9	12.6	18.4	8.9
\$0.25 a pack	9.6	20.3	5.5	12.4	25.1	7.3	16.9	42.7	7.6	13.5	17.2	11.2
None	15.8	23.5	12.8	17.3	28.3	12.9	19.5	34.1	14.3	19.4	34.2	10.1
DK/Refused	2.9	0.4	3.9	2.2	2.6	2.1	6.8	4.7	7.5	2.5	1.9	2.9

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 6.4 Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control Efforts in LGBT Community

Most LGBT people do not perceive that smoking is a bigger health problem for them than for people in general. Only 31.6% of LGBT men perceive that smoking is a bigger problem for them than for men in general. Among gay/bisexual men, the percentage is greater-37.1%. Among LGBT women, 20.1% perceive that smoking is a bigger problem than for women in general. Among lesbian/bisexual women, the percentage is higher 25.5%. Among transgender respondents, 21% perceived their group as facing a bigger problem than people in general.

A little over one-third of LGBT people (37%) feels like anti-smoking campaigns ignore the LGBT community. This group is larger among gay/bisexual men (42.8%), lesbian/bisexual women (45.9%), and transgender individuals (53.9%).

These data are presented in the next two tables.

**Table 6-6a.**  
**Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control Efforts in the LGBT Community**

	LGBT Overall %	LGBT Men %	LGBT Women %
Smoking is a bigger health problem for gay/bi men than for men in general	24.8	31.6	20.0
Smoking is a bigger health problem for lesbian/bi women than for women in general	21.2	22.8	20.1
Smoking is a bigger health problem for transgender or transsexual people than for people in general	18.9	21.6	17.0
Anti-smoking campaigns ignore the LGBT community	37.0	38.3	36.2

Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

**Table 6-6b.**  
**Attitudes Toward Tobacco Control Efforts in the LGBT Community by Smoking Status**

	Gay/Bisexual Men			Lesbian/Bisexual Women			Other LGBT Men			Other LGBT Women			Trans-gender	Gender Conforming
	Total	CS^	NCS+	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS	Total	CS	NCS		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Smoking is a bigger health problem for gay/bi men than for men in general	37.1	33.4	38.5	26.9	18.9	30.1	15.6	19.3	14.3	12.8	4.4	18.2	34.1	24.6
Smoking is a bigger health problem for lesbian/bi women than for women in general	25.6	19.4	28.0	25.5	22.3	26.8	14.5	19.2	12.9	14.4	7.4	18.9	31.8	21.0
Smoking is a bigger health problem for transgender or transsexual people than for people in general	23.2	16.9	25.6	23.4	23.5	23.3	16.9	25.0	14.0	10.4	5.0	13.8	21.0	18.8
Anti-smoking campaigns ignore the LGBT community	42.8	43.5	42.6	45.9	42.5	47.3	25.1	24.5	25.4	26.2	25.0	27.0	53.9	36.7

^ Current smoker. + Not current smoker. Source: 2004 CA LGBT Tobacco Use Survey.

## 6.5 Comparisons to California Tobacco Survey

In the LGBT study, about three-quarters (73.6%) recalled exposure to anti-tobacco messages in the last 30 days. Although the published CTS data are not exactly comparable, rates of recall were similarly high. In both populations, younger individuals were more likely than older individuals to recall anti-tobacco messages.

A comparison of LGBT Tobacco Survey data with that for the general population of the state indicates that LGBT adults are somewhat more supportive of a cigarette tax increase of at least \$.50/pack (67.1%) than general population adults (60.7%) and that large majorities of the both populations recall anti-tobacco messages. In addition, in both populations, anti-tobacco message recall is highest for young adults and seems to decline as individuals get older.

# Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations

This chapter of the report summarizes study conclusions and recommendations. It is organized by main study topics.

## 1 Composition of California LGBT Population

- **The California LGBT population is extremely diverse; this diversity has major implications for program planning and development efforts.**

The study found that California LGBT adults are extremely diverse in terms of how they view their identities and behavior. Many do not identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. More than one-quarter are married to, or partnered with, individuals of the opposite gender. As a result, smoking cessation, and other tobacco control efforts, that target only self-identifying gay, lesbian, and bisexual people may not effectively reach many members of the LGBT population. Also, only 6% of LGBT adults live in gay/lesbian enclaves, suggesting a need for programs to be far more broadly targeted geographically than they currently are.

About half of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals are out about their sexual orientation to at least most of their friends, family, and co-workers. The other half are out to only some people in these social networks. About one-quarter of the LGBT population has never used an LGBT-identified media or social outlet and others have done so only infrequently. Only 42.1% said they felt a part of the LGBT community. These data suggest that reliance on LGBT-identified organizations, communication sources, and channels will leave many LGBT adults un-served.

Clearly ways must be found to reach those LGBT adults who do not self-identify as LGBT or feel affiliated with LGBT community institutions. We are hopeful that upcoming data analysis work will help us better understand the differences between these population segments as well as the implications for policy and intervention development. Once this analysis work is completed, we suggest that TCS convene a working group, or session, to formulate specific recommendations for how to reach the most challenging segments of the LGBT population.

## 2 Smoking Behavior

- **It is urgent to address the high rate of smoking within the LGBT population, especially among LGBT women.**

Smoking prevalence for the overall LGBT population is 30.4%, about double that of the general population. LGBT men smoke at a rate about 50% higher than men generally, 27.4% compared to 19.1%. The difference between the LGBT and general populations is most pronounced among women, however: LGBT women smoke at nearly three times the rate of women generally (32.5% compared to 11.9%).

LGBT women are more likely than LGBT men to be daily smokers (23.7% vs. 18.8%). This is in contrast to the findings for the general population where men were more likely than women to be daily smokers (13.4% vs. 8.9%). These findings provide compelling evidence that smoking prevalence, as well as probable level of addiction, is a more serious problem among LGBT women than among either men or women in the general population or LGBT men.

The smoking rate for lesbian/bisexual women (28.4%) is more than double the rate for women generally (11.9%), according to the 2002 CTS. The rate for other LGBT women (38.8%) is more than triple the rate for women in the general population.

It is our hypothesis-and it is supported by some previous research-that these high smoking prevalence rates may be a response to anti-gay harassment, internalized homophobia, concealment of sexual orientation, high rates of HIV/AIDS, and other social stresses that LGBT people face. They may also be the result of aggressive industry promotion of tobacco products to the LGBT population, the rate of other substance use within the LGBT population, and other factors. We plan to carefully explore these, and other possible, explanations in the next phases of analytical work on these study data.

- **There is evidence that a sizeable number of LGBT former smokers are at risk for relapse.**

Study data suggest that a sizeable number of non-daily and former smokers may be at some risk for relapse. For more than one-quarter of non-daily and former smokers, it has been less than a year since they smoked on a daily basis, not a very long period of time. In addition, 7.4% of former smokers have smoked one or more cigarettes in the last 30 days and over one in five reported having taken a puff (20.8%).

- **Although the LGBT and general populations are quite similar with regard to cigarette consumption levels, it is encouraging that the proportion of smokers who are light smokers is higher within the LGBT population.**

More smokers in the LGBT population (70.2%) are light smokers than smokers in the general population (61.5%), and hence may be less addicted and more likely to quit. The two populations are nearly identical in the proportion of non-daily smokers, between approximately 25% and 30% of all smokers. LGBT women (73.2%) are a little more likely than LGBT men (64.9%) to be light smokers.

### 3 Smoking Cessation

- **As in the general population, large numbers of LGBT smokers have attempted to quit smoking.**

The percentages of both populations making quit attempts of varying lengths are about the same. Given their higher rate of smoking, it is encouraging that LGBT women are more likely than LGBT men to report quit attempts. The LGBT and general adult populations are also similar in another way: about one-quarter of smokers in both report that they both live and work in smoke-free environments, a factor associated with success in quitting.

- **NRT is the most commonly used cessation aid used by LGBT men and women in their most recent quit attempt.**

About one in four (25%) of those attempting to quit used NRT, more than in the general population (15.7%). It was most popular among moderate and heavy LGBT smokers. Two out of five of these smokers (37.2%) reported using it.

- **Fewer LGBT smokers who visit health professionals are advised to quit smoking than their general population counterparts.**

In the general adult population, 57.2% of smokers visiting a health professional in the last year were advised to quit smoking. In the LGBT population, the percentage was lower, 44.5%. In order to address this disparity we recommend that TCS, and its partners in LGBT tobacco control work, take steps to encourage health and medical providers to do a better job of intervening with their LGBT patients who smoke, especially providers that serve large numbers of openly LGBT people.

- **Only a few LGBT smokers seem interested in LGBT-tailored smoking cessation interventions.**

About 5% of LGBT smokers said that they preferred tailored cessation interventions. As would be expected, more gay/bisexual identifying men and lesbian/bisexual identifying women had an interest in LGBT-specific programs than other LGBT men and women in our sample. Nevertheless, interest in tailored interventions seems to be quite limited.

- **About 40% of LGBT smokers may be unlikely to quit.**

The LGBT Tobacco Survey assessed the number of people who are not likely to quit based on behavior (no quit attempt for one or more days in the last year) or attitude (disagreement with a statement that they would like to stop smoking). Presently, approximately 40% of current LGBT smokers fit this definition—they either have made no quit attempt or they say they do not want to stop smoking.

Those who seem most likely to quit are light, non-daily smokers. Heavy smokers seem least likely to quit; some 60.9% have not attempted to quit in the last year and do not report that they want to stop smoking. More than 70% of LGBT women who smoke heavily seem unlikely to quit.

## 4 Secondhand Smoke Exposure

- **LGBT adults, like Californians generally, accept that exposure to SHS is dangerous.**

LGBT adults are slightly more likely to believe that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette can cause lung cancer in a nonsmoker. Among the LGBT population, 79.3% believe this compared with 72.1% of the general adult population. LGBT persons are also slightly more likely to believe that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette harms the health of babies and children (94.5% compared to 90.9% for the general population).

- **As with Californians generally, almost all LGBT adults (96.6%) who work indoors report that their workplace has a smoke-free policy. Despite these smoke-free policies, however, there is cause for concern about SHS exposure rates within the LGBT population.**

Among all LGBT adults, 12.5% report some exposure to SHS in the workplace; however, the rates are much higher in some LGBT population segments. Study data on gender-based differences in SHS exposure are particularly striking. One in five LGBT Hispanic women (21%) and those of some other (non-white) race/ethnicity (22.3%) report exposure to SHS in their work area within the last two weeks. Rates of exposure among LGBT women with household incomes under \$30,000 range from 26.7% to 32.5%.

LGBT women who work in restaurants and bars (41.5%) as well as hospitals, retirement homes, and health clinics (30.4%) are exposed at over three times the rate as women working in other settings. One group of men also has an especially high rate: LGBT men with less than a high school degree (65.8%).

These LGBT Tobacco Survey data are similar to those for the general population with two exceptions: LGBT adults with less than a high school degree are more likely to be exposed (35.7% vs. 16.1%) as are those with household annual incomes under \$30,000. Among these low-income adults, rates of exposure range from 20.5% to 29.4% for LGBT adults compared to 12.2% to 19.8% for general population adults.

These data suggest that the California Tobacco Control Program should make targeted smoke-free policy enforcement and public information efforts a greater priority, in order to reduce these relatively high levels of exposure to SHS.

- **About seven out of ten LGBT adults (67.9%) report that smoking is completely prohibited in their households, a lower percentage than among Californians generally.**

Total bans on smoking exist in somewhat fewer LGBT households (67.9%) than in the general population (76.9%). The difference between the two populations is even greater among less educated and lower income households. The institution of household bans also lags among these LGBT population segments: 18-to 24-year-old men (51.1%), current smokers (47.2%) and Hispanic men (54.8%).

Among LGBT households where there is at least one smoker and a child present, 63.1% have total smoking bans. Given the large number of children affected in these households without bans, public education efforts focused on the LGBT population should give added emphasis to the harmful effects of SHS.

- **Sizeable numbers of LGBT adults report exposure to SHS in places other than home and work.**

Almost two out of five LGBT adults report that they are often exposed to SHS in places other than work or home (39.6%). These places include private automobiles, building entrances and other outdoor spaces.

- **Large numbers of LGBT adults appear to be asserting their right to smoke free environments.**

Over half of LGBT nonsmokers (52.3%) find others' smoking to be very or extremely annoying and 42.6% of nonsmokers asked someone to stop smoking within the 12 months prior to our interview. Almost as many LGBT smokers (37.4%) have done the same, even though they smoke themselves. Over half of LGBT smokers (57.4%) report being asked not to smoke by someone else in the last 12 months. In addition, three out of five LGBT smokers report that they rarely smoke when they are the only smoker in a group.

## 5 Tobacco Advertising and Promotion

- **Recall of cigarette ads in magazines is almost universal, although few LGBT adults believe the ads are especially designed to appeal to LGBT people.**

More than 90% of LGBT adults recall seeing cigarette ads in magazines. Less than one in five (16.3%) believed that the ads were especially designed to appeal to LGBT people. The study found a low level of awareness about TI marketing efforts targeted to the LGBT population. Only about one-third of respondents knew that the tobacco companies target LGBT people in their marketing efforts. These data suggest that additional education and information efforts are needed in this area.

- **Evidence suggests that the proportion of LGBT people receiving promotional items is comparable to that for the State's general population.**

About 7% of LGBT adults report receipt of free samples of tobacco products, although this percentage is far greater among some LGBT population segments. In terms of branded promotional items, 5.8% of LGBT adults reported that they either bought or received one free. Comparable data from CTS indicates that exposure levels are about the same in both populations. These data are somewhat surprising given efforts by the tobacco companies to target the LGBT population.

- **There is broad support for tobacco industry marketing restrictions, although many LGBT adults do not agree that LGBT organizations should refuse contributions from tobacco companies.**

A large majority of the LGBT population (70.1%) supports extending the current restriction on cigarette advertising to all media. An even bigger majority (78.3%) agrees that tobacco advertising encourages young people to smoke. Only a bare majority (52.7%), however, agrees that LGBT organizations should not accept money from tobacco companies.

## 6 The California Tobacco Control Program

- **Although the rate of recall of anti-tobacco messages is high, at least roughly comparable to that for the general adult population of the State, the messages do not appeal to many LGBT adults.**

About three-quarters of the LGBT population recalls exposure to anti-tobacco messages in the last 30 days, about the same level of recall for the general population. Many LGBT adults do not find the messages appealing to either themselves or LGBT people as a whole. In addition, more than one-third believes that anti-smoking campaigns ignore the LGBT community. Among gay/bisexual men, lesbian/bisexual women, and transgender individuals, even more share this belief.

In light of these data, the TCS should re-examine its current LGBT-targeted public communications efforts. Consideration should be given to mounting a comprehensive anti-tobacco media campaign targeting the LGBT population. In order to ensure that it has maximum impact, health promotion and communications professionals with expertise in the LGBT population should advise on its development.

- **Much work remains in order to convince LGBT people that they face a tobacco-related health crisis.**

Despite the large disparity in smoking rates, most LGBT people do not perceive that smoking is a bigger health problem for them than for others. Only about one-third of LGBT men perceive that smoking is a bigger problem for them than for men in general. Among LGBT women and transgender individuals, the percentage is even lower. Dissemination of information about these disparities should be a focus of future tobacco control efforts targeted to the LGBT population.

- **There is broad support for an increased tax on cigarettes, and government regulation of tobacco products, but little support for a ban on the production and sale of cigarettes in the United States.**

About eight in ten LGBT adults support an increased tax on cigarettes in California. Sixty-seven percent of LGBT respondents supported an increase of at least \$.50/pack compared with 61% of California adults generally. There is overwhelming agreement (83.5%) within the California LGBT population that tobacco companies could lower the nicotine content of tobacco products if they wanted to. About six in ten (59.6%) also agree that tobacco products should be regulated by a government agency such as the FDA. There is little support (24.6%), however, for banning the production and sale of cigarette products in the U.S.

- **In light of the needs identified in this study, California Tobacco Control Program efforts targeted to the LGBT population should be reassessed and enhanced.**

The California Tobacco Control Program should assess state as well as local resources currently devoted to LGBT tobacco control goals in light of the needs identified in this study. As a result of the assessment, plans should be developed for a more comprehensive and coordinated LGBT tobacco control program in California, a program providing culturally competent prevention and cessation services to the highest-risk segments of the LGBT population. As part of the program, increased support and assistance should be given to LGBT tobacco control programs including assistance with how to best frame tobacco control as a social justice issue. In addition, there is a need to educate policymakers and health service providers on how to develop and implement culturally competent programs and services targeted to the LGBT community.

## **7 The Need for Additional Research**

- **Although this study is an important step forward, there is need for additional research into tobacco use behaviors and their determinants within the California LGBT population.**

We recommend a number of research initiatives. First, state and local surveillance efforts should be modified so that data on sexual orientation and gender identification are routinely gathered on all California Tobacco Control Program sponsored projects. Second, special surveillance studies are needed to identify which segments of the LGBT population are disproportionately impacted by smoking, especially those segments defined by race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, age, and gender identification. The present study was not designed to look at these issues and they are vitally important ones. Third, in addition to this study, more research is needed on the determinants of smoking and quitting behaviors among LGBT people. Such research should use varied methodologies to uncover how identity (gender, sexual and ethnic), socio-economic status, psychological



factors, geography, and other factors contribute to smoking and cessation behaviors. Finally, more research should be conducted on how TI marketing efforts target the LGBT population and important segments within it.

- **There is a need to evaluate programs and interventions targeted to LGBT populations and individuals.**

The California Tobacco Control Program should take steps to ensure that LGBT focused tobacco control programs are carefully evaluated. In addition, steps should be taken to assess how LGBT persons fare in standard prevention and cessation programs aimed the general population. One aspect of this work should be to better understand the relevance of existing best practices to the needs of LGBT individuals. Another should be the development of best practice guidelines specifically for serving LGBT people.

- **The California Tobacco Control Program should ensure that LGBT tobacco researchers are involved and supported in their work.**

LGBT tobacco researchers should participate along with mainstream tobacco researchers when research priorities and actual project funding decisions are being made. In addition, young and/or new LGBT tobacco researchers should be supported and mentored, particularly those from historically disenfranchised segments of the LGBT population.

# Chapter 7: References

Aaron D.J., N. Markovic, et. al. (2001). "Behavioral Risk Factors for Disease and Preventive Health Practices Among Lesbians", *American Journal of Public Health*. 91(6):972-975.

Andresen E.M., J. Malmgren, W.B. Carter, D.L. Patrick (1994). "Screening for Depression in Well Older Adults: Evaluation of a Short Form of the CES-D (Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale)", *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*. 10(2):77-84.

Baer J. and E. Licktenstein, (1998). "Classification and Prediction of Smoking Relapse Episodes: An Exploration of Individual Differences", *Journal of Consulting and Clinic Psycholog*. 56(1):104-110.

Beatty R., M. Geckle, et. al. (1999). "Gay Men, Lesbians and Bisexuals". *Addictions: A Comprehensive Guidebook*. E. Epstein. New York: Oxford University Press. 542-551.

Begtrup K., M. Melbye, et. al. (1997). "Progression to Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome is Influenced by CD4 T-lymphocyte Count and Time Since Seroconversion", *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 145(7):629-35.

Bien T.H. and R. Burge, (1990). "Smoking and Drinking: A Review of the Literature". *International Journal of Addictions*. 25:1429-1454.

Binson D., J. Moskowitz, et. al. (1996). "Sampling Men Who Have Sex With Men: Strategies for a Telephone Survey in Urban Areas in the United States, Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods (Vol. I)", *American Statistical Association*.

Blair J. (1999). "A Probability Sample of Gay Urban Males: The Use of Two-Phase Adaptive Sampling", *The Journal of Sex Research*. 36(1):39-44.

Boyd C.J., S.E. McCabe, et. al. (2003). "Ecstasy Use Among College Undergraduates: Gender, Race and Sexual Identity", *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 24(3):209-15.

Bradford J., K. Barrett and J.A. Honnold (2002). *The 2000 Census and Same-Sex Households: A User's Guide*, New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute, the Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory, and The Fenway Institute.

Bye L. and J. Diamond (December 31, 2002). *Proposed Zip Codes for Inclusion in High Density Sample Stratum, California Department of Health Services' (DHS), Tobacco Control Section (TCS) LGBT Tobacco Survey*", Memorandum from Field Research Corporation to TCS.

Bye L. and V. Albright (July 15, 2003). "LGBT Tobacco Survey: Key Assumptions for Final Sample Design". Memorandum from Field Research Corporation to TCS.

Bye L. and V. Albright (July 15, 2003). "LGBT Tobacco Survey: Sample Management Plan". Memorandum from Field Research Corporation to TCS.

DHS, TCS, (2000). "California Tobacco Control Update." 11th World Conference on Tobacco OR Health, Chicago, IL.

Catania J., J. Canchola, L. Pollack, and J. Chang, (2001). "Understanding Survey Sample Demographic Characteristics of Men Who Have Sex With Men". Health Survey Research Unit, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, Department of Medicine, University CA, San Francisco (UCSF). Proceedings of the American Statistical Association.

Catania J., J. Canchola, and L. Pollack (2001). "Estimating the Population Size and Distribution of MSM (Men Who Have Sex With Men) Using Survey Data". Health Survey Research Unit, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, Department of Medicine, UCSF. Report prepared for DHS, Office of AIDS. Funding provided by the National Institute of Mental Health and National Institute on Aging.

Catania J., J. Canchola, et. al. (2001). "Mapping and Cost Estimates for HIV-Related Surveys of MSM in California". Health Survey Research Unit, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, Department of Medicine, UCSF. Report prepared for DHS, Office of AIDS. Funding provided by the National Institute of Mental Health and National Institute on Aging.

Catania J., R. Stall, et. al. (1996). *The Behavioral Questionnaire: The Urban Men's Health Study*. San Francisco, CA.

Clements-Nolle K., R. Marx, et. al. (2001). "HIV Prevalence, Risk Behaviors, Health Care Use, and Mental Health Status of Transgender Persons: Implications for Public Health Intervention". *American Journal of Public Health*. 91(6):915-921.

Cochran, S.D., (September 27-28, 1999). "Estimating Prevalence of Mental and Substance-Using Disorders Among Lesbians and Gay Men from National Health Data". Paper presented at the National Institutes of Health Workshop New Approaches to Research on Sexual Orientation, Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Rockville, M.D.

Cochran, S.D. and V.M., Mays (2000). "Relation Between Psychiatric Syndromes and Behaviorally Defined Sexual Orientation in a Sample of the US Population". *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 151(5):516-23.

Cochran S.D., V.M. Mays, et. al. (2001). "Cancer-Related Risk Indicators and Preventive Screening Behaviors Among Lesbians and Bisexual Women". *American Journal of Public Health*. 91(4):591-7.

Cohen S., T. Kamarck, et. al. (1983). "A Global Measure of Perceived Stress". *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 24(4):385-396.

Cole J.W., A.N. Pinto, et. al. (2004). "Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome and the Risk of Stroke". *Stroke*. 35:51-56.

Conley L.J., T.J. Bush, et. al. (1996). "The Association Between Cigarette Smoking and Selected HIV-Related Medical Conditions". *AIDS*. 10(10):1121-6.

Craib K.J., M.T. Schechter, et. al. (1992). "The Effect of Cigarette Smoking on Lymphocyte Subsets and Progression to AIDS in a Cohort of Homosexual Men". *Clinical and Investigative Medicine. Medecine Clinique et. Experimentale*. 15(4):301-8.

Diamant A.L., et. al. (2000). "Health Behaviors, Health Status and Access to and Use of Health Care: A Population-Based Study of Lesbian, Bisexual and Heterosexual Women". (In process citation). *Archives of Family Medicine*. 9(10):1043-51.

Diamant A.L., M.A. Schuster, et. al. (2000). "Receipt of Preventive Health Care Services by Lesbians" *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 19(3):141-8.

DiPlacido J. (1998). *Minority Stress and Well-Being Among Lesbians*. American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Elliot S. (1997). "A Campaign Urges Gay Men and Lesbians to Resist Tobacco Ads". *New York Times*. New York.

Fishbein H., M. Larsen, et. al. (1998). *Independent Evaluation of the California Tobacco Control Prevention and Education Program: Wave 1 Data. 1996-1997*. Sacramento, CA: DHS.

- Galai N., L.P. Park, et. al. (1997). "Effect of Smoking on the Clinical Progression of HIV-1 Infection". *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes and Human Retrovirology*. 14(5):451-8.
- Garofalo R., R.C. Wolf, et. al. (1999). "Sexual Orientation and Risk of Suicide Attempts Among a Representative Sample of Youth". *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*. 153(5):487-93.
- Gates G., D. Black, S. Sanders, and L. Taylor (1999). "Demographics of the Gay and Lesbian Population in the United States: Evidence from Available Systematic Data Sources". Working Paper No. 12. Syracuse, NY: Center for Policy Research, Syracuse University.
- Gates G., D. Black, S. Sanders, and L. Taylor, (2000). "Why do Gay Men Live in San Francisco?" Unpublished report to the National Institute for Child and Human Development.
- Gilpin E.A., M.M. White, et. al. (2004). "Tobacco Control Successes in California: A Focus on Young People". Results from the California Tobacco Surveys, 1990-2002. La Jolla, CA: University of California, San Diego.
- Giovino G.A. (2003). Tobacco Surveillance in the United States (U.S.) National Conference on Tobacco OR Health, Boston, MS.
- Goebel K. (1994). "Lesbians and Gays Face Tobacco Targeting". *Tobacco Control*. 3(1):65-67.
- Greenwood, G.L., J. Paul, L. Pollack, et. al. (In Press). "Tobacco Use and Cessation Among a Household-Based Sample of Urban Men Who Have Sex With Men (MSM) in the U.S." *American Journal of Public Health*.
- Gruskin E.P. (in preparation). "Alcohol, Stress and Coping: A Qualitative Analysis."
- Gruskin E.P. (in preparation). "Smoking and Alcohol Use in a Large HMO."
- Gruskin E.P., S. Hart, N. Gordon, and L. Ackerson (2001). "Patterns of Cigarette Smoking and Alcohol Use Among Lesbians and Bisexual Women Enrolled in a Large Health Maintenance Organization". *American Journal of Public Health*. 91(6):976-979.
- Hughes T.L. and S.C. Wilsnack (1997). "Use of Alcohol Among Lesbians: Research and Clinical Implications." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 67(1):20-36.
- Kegeles S., R. Hays, C. Waldo, and L. Pollack (1996). The whole is greater than the sum of its parts: An analysis of the intervention components of an HIV prevention program for young Gay men. XII International Conference on AIDS, Geneva.
- Lauman E.O., J.H. Gagnon, et. al. (1994). "Homosexuality". *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 283-320.
- Ling P.M. and S.A. Glantz (2002). Using TI marketing research to design more effective tobacco control campaigns. UCSF, Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, Institute for Health Policy Studies.
- Lippman J. (1992). Philip Morris to push brand in gay media. *Wall Street Journal*: 13.
- Mays V.M. and S.D. Cochran (2001). "Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults in the United States". *American Journal of Public Health*. 91(11):1869-76.

- McFarland W., M.P. Busch, et. al. (1999). "Detection of Early HIV Infection and Estimation of Incidence Using a Sensitive/Less-Sensitive Enzyme Immunoassay Testing Strategy at Anonymous Counseling and Testing Sites in San Francisco". *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 22(5):484-9.
- Meyer I.H. (1995). "Minority Stress and Mental Health in Gay Men". *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 36(1):38-56.
- Meyer I.H. (2003). "Prejudice, Social Stress, and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence". *Psychology Bulletin*. 129(5):674-97.
- Mills T.C., R. Stall, et. al. (2001). Depression among a household-based sample of urban men who have sex with men (MSM). UCSF, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies.
- Mills T.C., R. Stall, L. Pollack et. al. (2001). "Health-Related Characteristics of Men Who Have Sex With Men: A Comparison of Those Living in "Gay Ghettos" With Those Living Elsewhere". *American Journal of Public Health*. 91(6):980-983.
- Mills T.C., R. Stall, et. al. (1997). "Interpreting HIV Prevalence and Incidence Among Americans: Bridging Data and Public Policy". *American Journal of Public Health*. 87(5):864-6.
- NADR (2004). "The core instrument used in the NIDA supported National AIDS Demonstration Research Project (NADR)."
- Nawyn S.J., J.A. Richman, et. al. (2000). "Sexual identity and alcohol-related outcomes: Contributions of workplace harassment." *Journal of Substance Abuse*. 11(3):289 304.
- Otis M.D. and W.F. Skinner (1996). "The prevalence of victimization and its effect on mental well-being among lesbian and gay people." *Journal of Homosexuality*. 30(3):93 121.
- Page-Shafer K., G.N. Delorenze, et. al. (1996). "Comorbidity and survival in HIV infected men in the San Francisco Men's Health Survey." *Annals of Epidemiology*. 6(5):420-30.
- Paul J., D. Binson, et. al. (2001). Determinants of smoking among LGB youth. UCSF, Center for AIDS Prevention Studies.
- Radloff L.S. (1977). "The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population." *Applied Psychological Measurement*. 1(3):385-401.
- Reback C.J. and C.E. Grella (1999). "HIV Risk Behaviors of Gay and Bisexual Male Methamphetamine Users Contacted Through Street Outreach". *Journal of Drug Issues*. 29(1):155-166.
- Remafedi G., S. French, et. al. (1998). "The Relationship Between Suicide Risk and Sexual Orientation: Results of a Population-Based Study". *American Journal of Public Health*. 88(1):57-60.
- Savin-Williams R.C. (1994). "Verbal and Physical Abuse as Stressors in the Lives of Lesbian, Gay Male, and Bisexual Youth: Association with School Problems, Running Away, Substance Abuse, Prostitution, and Suicide". *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 62(2):261-269.
- Sheahan S.L., S.J. Coons, et. al. (1994). "Sexual Behavior, Communication, and Chlamydial Infections Among College Women". *Health Care Women Int*. 15(4):275-86.
- Shiffman S. and T.A. Wills (1985). *Coping and substance abuse*. New York, Academic Press.

Skinner W.F., (1994). "The Prevalence and Demographic Predictors of Illicit and Licit Drug Use Among Lesbians and Gay Men". *American Journal of Public Health*. 84(8):1307-10.

Skinner W.F. & Otis M.D. (1996). "Drug and Alcohol Use Among Lesbian and Gay People in a Southern US Sample: Epidemiological, Comparative, and Methodological Findings From the Trilogy Project". *Journal of Homosexuality*. 30:59-91.

Gates G. and D.M. Smith (2001). "Gay and Lesbian Families in the United States: Same Sex Unmarried Partner Households". A Preliminary Analysis of 2000 United States Census Data: A Human Rights Campaign Report. Washington, DC: Human Rights Campaign.

Sorensen L. and S.J. Roberts (1997). "Lesbian Uses of and Satisfaction With Mental Health Services: Results From Boston Lesbian Health Project". *Journal of Homosexuality*. 33(1):35-49.

Stall R.D., G.L. Greenwood, et. al. (1999). "Cigarette Smoking Among Gay and Bisexual Men". *American Journal of Public Health*. 89(12):1875-8.

Stall R.D., J.Paul, et. al. (2001). "Alcohol Use, Drug Use and Alcohol-Related Problems Among Men Who Have Sex With Men: The Urban Men's Health Study". *Addiction*. 96:1589-1601.

Tang H., Greenwood G.L., Cowling D., Lloyd J., Roeseler A., Bal D. (In Press). "Cigarette Smoking Among Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals: How Serious a Problem?" *Cancer Causes and Control*.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS) (1989). Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking: 25 Years of Progress. A Report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, GA: USDHSS, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health. DHHS Pub. No. (CDC) 89-8411.

USDHSS (2000). Reducing Tobacco Use. A Report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, GA: USDHSS, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health. S/N 017-001-0544-4.

Valanis B.G., D.J. Bowen, et. al. (2000). "Sexual Orientation and Health: Comparisons in the Women's Health Initiative Sample". *Archives of Family Medicine*. 9(9):843-53.

VanScoy H. (1997). Health behaviors in lesbians. *Handbook of Health Behavior Research III: Demography, Development, and Diversity*. D. Gochman. New York, Plenum Press. 141-160.

Weatherby N.L. and R. Needle (1994). "Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use Among Injection Drug Users and Crack Cocaine Users Recruited Through Street Outreach. Special issue: Evaluating drug abuse interventions". *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 17(4):347-355.

Weisner, Constance and Schmidt, Laura. (1993). Alcohol and drug problems among diverse health and social service populations. *American Journal of Public Health*, 83(6), 824-829. (B563) Data from the 1988 general population survey, 1987 alcohol treatment survey, 1985 emergency room survey, 1986 mental health survey, 1988 primary health survey, 1989 criminal justice survey, 1989 welfare survey, and 1987 drug treatment survey of the Community Epidemiology Laboratory.



# Appendices

Field Research Corporation  
San Francisco, CA

CA LGBT Tobacco Survey  
February 17, 2004

## Appendix A1 CALIFORNIA LGBT TOBACCO SURVEY – Screening Instrument –

### CONFIRMATION OF HOUSEHOLD STATUS

S1. Hello, my name is {interviewer name} and I'm calling on behalf of the University of California and the California Department of Health Services. We are conducting a health study of California adults. We are not selling anything or asking for money.

- 1 CONTINUE
- 2 LANGUAGE BARRIER (THANK CONTACT AND CODE LANGUAGE BARRIER)
- 3 GO TO SMS MENU
- 4 HANG UP DURING INTRO

### LOCATING AN ADULT INFORMANT

S2. Your telephone number has been randomly selected to be a part of this study. May I please speak with a member of the household who is 18 years of age or older?

- 1 CONTACT IS AN ADULT (SKIP TO S4b)
- 2 I'LL GET HIM/HER
- 3 ADULT NOT AVAILABLE (SCHEDULE CALLBACK IF POSSIBLE AND CONTINUE WITH S3)
- 4 NO ADULTS LIVE IN HH (THANK CONTACT AND CODE AGE-INELIGIBLE; TERMINATE)
- 5 LANGUAGE BARRIER (THANK CONTACT AND CODE LANGUAGE BARRIER)
- 6 GO TO SMS MENU
- 5 REFUSED PERMISSION (THANK CONTACT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)
- 6 HANG UP DURING INTRO

### RECONFIRMATION OF INFORMANT AGE AND HOUSEHOLD STATUS

S3. [WHEN ADULT IS ON THE PHONE] Hello, my name is {interviewer} and I am calling on behalf of the University of California and the California Department of Health Services. We are conducting an important health study. The information will be used by medical and public health workers to plan disease prevention programs for your community. Are you at least 18 years old?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO (RETURN TO S2, SECOND SENTENCE)
- 3 LANGUAGE BARRIER (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE LANGUAGE BARRIER)
- 4 GO TO SMS MENU
- 7 DECLINED TO ANSWER (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)
- 8 HANG UP DURING INTRO

S4b. (IF RESPONDENT SKIPPED S3, READ FIRST TWO SENTENCES OF WHAT FOLLOWS. OTHERWISE, GO DIRECTLY TO 3RD SENTENCE.) As I said, we are conducting a health study today. The information will be used by medical and public health workers to plan disease prevention programs in your community. Is this phone number used for...

- 1 Home use only,
- 2 Business use only, or (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE BUSINESS; TERMINATE)
- 3 For both home and business use?
- 8 DON'T KNOW (THANK RESPONDENT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)
- 9 REFUSED (THANK RESPONDENT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)
- 10 HANG UP DURING INTRO



### CONFIRMATION OF INFORMANT GENDER

S5a. (ASK WHETHER MALE OR FEMALE . DO NOT ASSUME YOU KNOW GENDER BASED ON VOICE QUALITIES) Are you...

- 1 Male (SKIP TO S5b), or,
- 2 Female, (SKIP TO S5b)
- VOL. ONLY → 3 SOMETHING ELSE (SPECIFY:\_\_\_\_\_)
- 9 DECLINED TO ANSWER (THANK RESPONDENT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)

(IF SOMETHING ELSE VOLUNTEERED ON PRECEEDING ITEM: )

Do you identify more as male or more as female?

- 1 Male (SAME SKIPS AS ABOVE)
- 2 Female (SAME SKIPS AS ABOVE)
- 9 DECLINED TO ANSWER (THANK RESPONDENT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)

### DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF ADULTS IN HOUSEHOLD

S5b. Your telephone number was randomly selected by computer for us to call. Now, we want to ask you some questions to see whether anyone in the household falls into the groups of people we are interviewing for the study. These questions will just take a couple of minutes. Including yourself, how many adults aged 18 or older live in your household?

\_\_\_\_\_ ADULTS

99 REFUSED

S5c. (IF CONTACT IS MALE AND S5b>1, ASK:) How many of the adults in the household are men?

\_\_\_\_\_ ADULT MEN

99 REFUSED

S5d. (IF CONTACT IS FEMALE AND S5b>1, ASK:) How many of the adults in the household are women?

\_\_\_\_\_ ADULT WOMEN

99 REFUSED

S5ver. CATI DISPLAYS THE CALCULATED NUMBER OF MALES AND FEMALES IN THE HOUSEHOLD BASED ON S5B/C/D.  
INTERVIEWER CONFIRMS NUMBER OF MALES AND FEMALES IN HOUSEHOLD.

**DETERMINATION OF LGBT ELIGIBILITY**

S6a. (IF S5b = 1 AND CONTACT IS FEMALE, ASK:)

In order to know if you can participate, I need to ask you a few questions. We promise to keep all answers confidential. For this interview, we are interested in speaking with people who are not often studied in public health research: lesbian and bisexual women. Would you include yourself in one of these groups?

(IF S5b = 1 AND CONTACT IS MALE, ASK:)

In order to know if you can participate, I need to ask you a few questions. We promise to keep all answers confidential. For this interview, we are interested in speaking with people who are not often studied in public health research: gay and bisexual men. Would you include yourself in one of these groups?

(IF S5b > 1 OR REF AND CONTACT IS FEMALE, ASK:)

In order to know who can participate in this study, I need to ask you a few questions about the adults who live in your household. We promise to keep all answers confidential. For these interviews, we are interested in speaking with people who are not often studied in public health research: lesbian and bisexual women. Would you include yourself in one of these groups?

(IF S5b > 1 OR REF AND CONTACT IS MALE, ASK:)

In order to know who can participate in this study, I need to ask you a few questions about the adults who live in your household. We promise to keep all answers confidential. For these interviews, we are interested in speaking with people who are not often studied in public health research: gay and bisexual men. Would you include yourself in one of these groups?

- 1 YES (IF S5b = 1, SKIP TO S17; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO S7)
- 2 NO (CONTINUE)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (CONTINUE)
- 9 REFUSED (CONTINUE)

S6b. (IF CONTACT IS FEMALE, ASK:)

Regardless of whether a person thinks of herself as lesbian, bisexual or heterosexual, we are also interested in speaking with women who have had sex with other women at any time in their life. (IF NECESSARY, SAY: Anytime after turning age 14). Do you fall into this category?

(IF CONTACT IS MALE, ASK:)

Regardless of whether a person thinks of himself as gay, bisexual or heterosexual, we are also interested in speaking with men who have had sex with other men at any time in their life. (IF NECESSARY, SAY: Anytime after turning age 14). Do you fall into this category?

- 1 YES (IF S5b = 1, SKIP TO S17; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO S7)
- 2 NO (CONTINUE)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (CONTINUE)
- 9 REFUSED (CONTINUE)

S6c. We are also interested in speaking with adults who consider themselves to be transgender or transsexual in any way. (IF NECESSARY, SAY: By this I mean people who have a gender identity or presentation that is different from what society says you should have for your birth sex.) Would you include yourself in this group?

- 1 YES (IF S5b = 1, SKIP TO S17; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO S7)
- 2 NO (IF S5b = 1, GO TO S6d; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO S7)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (IF S5b = 1, GO TO S6d; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO S7)
- 9 REFUSED (IF S5b = 1, GO TO S6d; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO S7)

S6d. (TERMINATE SEQUENCE)

Thank you. I have one final question. This is a tremendous help to us. We are trying to keep track of what areas of the state we are calling. Could you please tell me the ZIP code of the area where you live?

- \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP CODE
- 98 DON'T KNOW
  - 99 DECLINED TO ANSWER

## IDENTIFICATION OF MULTIPLE ELIGIBLE RESPONDENTS

S7a. (IF CONTACT IS MALE AND S5C = ONE OTHER ADULT MALE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, does the other adult male in your household fall into any of the groups I just mentioned? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

(IF CONTACT IS MALE AND S5D = ONE ADULT FEMALE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, has the adult female in your household had sex with women or does she identify as lesbian, bisexual, or transgender? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

(IF CONTACT IS FEMALE AND S5D = ONE OTHER ADULT FEMALE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, does the other adult female in your household fall into any of the groups I just mentioned? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

(IF CONTACT IS FEMALE AND S5C = ONE OTHER ADULT MALE IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, has the adult male in your household had sex with men or does he identify as gay, bisexual, or transgender? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

- 1 YES (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK OR REF, CODE HOUSEHOLD AS HAVING ONE ELIGIBLE. IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, CODE HOUSEHOLD AS HAVING TWO ELIGIBLES. IF TWO ELIGIBLES, SKIP RESPONDENT TO S9.)
- 2 NO (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)
- 9 REFUSED (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)

S7b. (IF CONTACT IS MALE AND S5 = TWO OR MORE OTHER ADULT MALES IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, do any of the other adult males in your household fall into any of the groups I just mentioned? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible. (IF NECESSARY: These groups include men who have had sex with men, or who identify as gay, bisexual, or transgender.)

(IF CONTACT IS MALE AND S5 = TWO OR MORE ADULT FEMALES IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, have any of the adult females in your household had sex with other women or do they identify as lesbian, bisexual, or transgender? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

(IF CONTACT IS FEMALE AND S5 = TWO OR MORE OTHER ADULT FEMALES IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, do any of the other adult females in your household fall into any of the groups I just mentioned? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible. (IF NECESSARY: These groups include women who have had sex with women, or who identify as lesbian, bisexual, or transgender.)

(IF CONTACT IS FEMALE AND S5 = TWO OR MORE ADULT MALES IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK:)  
To the best of your knowledge, have any of the adult males in your household had sex with other men or do they identify as gay, bisexual, or transgender? This is an important public health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

- 1 YES (SKIP TO S8 TO GET HOW MANY ELIGIBLES IN HOUSEHOLD.)
- 2 NO (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)
- 9 REFUSED (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)

S7c. (IF OTHER NON-SCREENED ADULTS IN HH ARE OF MIXED GENDER, ASK:) To the best of your knowledge, have any of the other adults in your household had sex with others of the same gender or do they identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender? This is an important health study and we want to be sure to include anyone who is eligible.

- 1 YES (SKIP TO S8 TO GET HOW MANY ELIGIBLES IN HOUSEHOLD)
- 2 NO (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)
- 9 REFUSED (IF S6a, S6b, AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO TERMINATE SEQUENCE (S7d). IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17.)

S7d. (TERMINATE SEQUENCE)  
Thank you. I have one final question. This is a tremendous help to us. We are trying to keep track of what areas of the state we are calling. Could you please tell me the ZIP code of the area where you live?

- \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP CODE
- 98 DON'T KNOW
  - 99 DECLINED TO ANSWER

S8. (IF S6a, S6b, OR S6c = YES, ASK:)  
Including yourself, how many adult males in the household fall into any of these groups? How many adult females? (RECORD NUMBER OF BOTH MALES AND FEMALES BELOW. IF NONE OF A GENDER, RECORD ZERO.)

(IF S6a, S6b AND S6c = NO, DK, OR REF, ASK:)  
How many of the adult males in the household fall into any of these groups? How many adult females? (RECORD NUMBER OF BOTH MALES AND FEMALES BELOW. IF NONE OF A GENDER, RECORD ZERO.)

\_\_\_\_\_ ADULT MALE(S)

\_\_\_\_\_ ADULT FEMALE(S)

98 DON'T KNOW

99 DECLINED TO ANSWER

[PROGRAMMER: S8 CANNOT BE ZERO]

(IF S8 = 1 AND S6a OR S6b OR S6c = YES, SKIP TO S17)

(IF S8 => 1, GO TO S9)

IF MALE QUOTA IN CURRENT STRATA IS FILLED, THEN:

IF S8 FEMALE = 1 AND CONTACT IS FEMALE, SKIP TO S17

IF S8 FEMALE = 1 AND CONTACT IS MALE, SKIP TO S12

IF S8 FEMALE > 1, SKIP TO S9

IF S8 MALE ≥ 1 AND S8 FEMALE = 0, SKIP TO QUOTA TERMINATE

NOTE:

QUOTA CHANGES IMPLEMENTED 3/9/04.

QUOTA NEVER IMPLEMENTED IN SPANISH.

(QUOTA TERMINATE:)

Thank you so much for your time today. These are all the questions I have.

(IF NECESSARY: We are not interviewing men right now.)

## RANDOM SELECTION AMONG MULTIPLE ELIGIBLE RESPONDENTS

(We are only interviewing women at this time.)

S9. Because we can only interview one person per household, the computer will now randomly select a respondent based on who has the next birthday coming up. Thinking about the (female) adults in your household who fall into the groups we are studying, please tell me which one is the next one to have a birthday?

1 INFORMANT (SKIP TO S17)

2 SOMEONE ELSE (SKIP TO S10a IF S8 INCLUDES MEN AND WOMEN, ELSE SKIP TO S12)

3 DON'T KNOW ALL BIRTHDAYS (SKIP TO S10)

S10. Of the birthdays you do know, whose birthday is coming up next?

1 INFORMANT (SKIP TO S17)

2 SOMEONE ELSE (SKIP TO S12)

9 DECLINE TO ANSWER (THANK RESPONDENT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)

(ASK S10a ONLY IF S8 INCLUDES MEN AND WOMEN)

S10a. What gender is this other person?

1 Male

2 Female

S11. (INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

## SCREENING SECOND INFORMANT

(We are only interviewing women at this time.)

S12. May I please speak to him/her (the woman in the house)?

- 1 I'LL GET HIM/HER
- 3 NOT HOME/NOT AVAILABLE (SCHEDULE CALLBACK IF POSSIBLE AND RESTART WITH S13 WHEN GET INDICATED NEW INFORMANT)
- 9 REFUSED PERMISSION (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)

S13. (WHEN NEW INFORMANT IS ON THE PHONE): Hello, my name is {interviewer name} and I am calling on behalf of the University of California and the California Department of Health Services. We are conducting an important health study. The information will be used by medical and public health workers to plan disease prevention programs for your community. All of your answers are confidential and at no time will your name be associated with the answers that you give. Are you at least 18 years old?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE AGE INELIGIBLE; TERMINATE)
- 8 LANGUAGE BARRIER (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE LANGUAGE BARRIER – TERMINATE IF NOT ENGLISH OR SPANISH)
- 9 REFUSED (THANK INFORMANT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL)

S14. In order to know if you can participate, I need to ask you a few questions. For this interview, we are interested in speaking with people who are not often studied in public health research: (gay and bisexual men) (lesbian and bisexual women). Would you include yourself in one of these groups?

- 1 YES (SKIP TO S17)
- 2 NO (CONTINUE)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (CONTINUE)
- 9 REFUSED (CONTINUE)

S15. We are also interested in speaking with (men/women) who may not think of themselves as (gay/lesbian) or bisexual but who have had sex with other (men/women) at some time in their lives. (IF NECESSARY, SAY: Anytime after turning 14.) Would you include yourself in this group?

- 1 YES (SKIP TO S17)
- 2 NO (CONTINUE)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (CONTINUE)
- 9 REFUSED (CONTINUE)

S16a. We are also interested in speaking with people who identify as transgender or transsexual in any way. (IF NECESSARY, SAY: By this I mean people who have a gender identity or presentation that is different from what society says you should have for your birth sex. ) Would you include yourself in this group?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO (CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO S16b TERMINATE SEQUENCE)
- 8 DON'T KNOW (CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO S16b TERMINATE SEQUENCE)
- 9 REFUSED (CODE LGBT INELIGIBLE AND GO TO S16b TERMINATE SEQUENCE)

S16b. (TERMINATE SEQUENCE)

Thank you. I have one final question. This is a tremendous help to us. We are trying to keep track of what areas of the state we are calling. Could you please tell me the ZIP code of the area where you live?

\_\_\_\_\_ ZIP CODE

- 98 DON'T KNOW
- 99 DECLINED TO ANSWER

## INFORMED CONSENT

S17. You have been selected to take part in our health study. It will take 20-30 minutes depending on the responses you give. The study is being conducted by the California Department of Health Services, in cooperation with the University of California. It involves collecting information about important health issues. Some of the study questions have to do with alcohol and drug use as well as certain sexual practices. Let me assure you that participation is completely voluntary. If you do not want to answer a certain question just let me know and I will move on to the next question. You may decline to continue the interview at any point. Be assured that the study is totally confidential and your name will never be associated with any answers you give me. For more information about the study you can contact Dr. Greg Greenwood at the University of California. You may also contact the University Committee on Human Research. I would be happy to give you the phone numbers or to send you a written copy of what I have just told you. Would you like the phone numbers or the written information?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

**(INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT ASKS FOR WRITTEN INFORMATION THEN COMPLETE A REQUEST FOR WRITTEN MATERIAL. WE WILL MAIL A PACKET THAT INCLUDES INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY AND THE EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS BILL OF RIGHTS. TURN THE REQUESTS IN TO A SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF YOUR SHIFT. IF RESPONDENT ASKS FOR THE PHONE NUMBERS, PROVIDE THEM AS FOLLOWS: DR. GREG GREENWOOD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IS AT 415-597-9164; THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESEARCH IS AT 415-476-1814.)**

**(INTERVIEWER: IF ASKED FOR INFORMATION YOU CANNOT PROVIDE, NOTE THE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS AND LET YOUR SUPERVISOR KNOW. TELL RESPONDENT WE WILL CALL THEM BACK WITH THE INFORMATION. GIVE THE RESPONDENT TIME TO WRITE DOWN ANY OF THE ABOVE INFORMATION IF THEY ARE INTERESTED)**

S18. Do you wish to participate in this interview?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO (ASK ZIP CODE, THANK RESPONDENT AND CODE SOFT/HARD REFUSAL; TERMINATE.)

## OTHER ITEMS

S19. Thank you. Just so you know, my supervisor may monitor this call to ensure quality.

Before we begin the interview, I need to get a couple of pieces of information from you for statistical purposes. Including this phone, how many different telephone numbers do you have in your house for home use? Please do not include cell phone numbers or any number used only for business calls, a computer modem, or a FAX machine. (READ IF NEEDED: Count all numbers for the household even if they are designated for certain household members only.)

- 1 ONLY 1 HOUSEHOLD TELEPHONE NUMBER
- 2 TWO OR MORE HOUSEHOLD NUMBERS
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 DECLINED TO ANSWER

S20. We also need to keep track of what areas of the state we are calling. Could you please tell me the ZIP code of the area where you live?

- \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP CODE
- 98 DON'T KNOW
  - 99 DECLINED TO ANSWER

---

Thank you. Now let's move to the interview itself!

**Appendix A2**  
**CALIFORNIA LGBT TOBACCO SURVEY**  
**– Survey Instrument –**

**GENERAL SMOKING QUESTIONS**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Okay, the first questions are about cigarette smoking.<br>These questions are for both smokers and non-smokers.<br>Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?<br><b>(NOTE: 5 PACKS = 100 CIGARETTES)</b> | YES.....1<br>NO .....2<br>DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF |
|---|---|

**IF YES, ASK:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 2. Do you now smoke cigarettes every day, some days or not at all? | EVERY DAY.....1<br>SOME DAYS .....2<br>NOT AT ALL.....3<br>DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF |
| 3. Have you ever smoked daily for six months or more?              | YES.....1<br>NO .....2<br>DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF                                  |

**IF Q2 = 2, 3, DK OR REF (CURRENT REGULAR OR FORMER SMOKER) AND Q3 = 1, ASK:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 4. How long has it been since you smoked on a daily basis? | YEARS (ENTER #: _____).....1<br>MONTHS (ENTER #: _____).....2<br>WEEKS (ENTER #: _____).....3<br>DAYS (ENTER #: _____).....4<br>TIME FRAME DOES NOT APPLY.....5<br>DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF |
|--|--|

**INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE  
SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN  
ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:**

YOU HAVE RECORDED \_\_\_\_\_.  
IS THIS CORRECT?

YES.....1  
NO .....2

**IF "NO," RETURN TO Q4, SELECT UNITS**

**IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR CURRENT REGULAR SMOKER), ASK:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 5. On the average, about how many cigarettes a day do you now smoke, on the days that you smoke? <b>(NOTE: 1 PACK = 20 CIGARETTES)</b> | # OF CIGARETTES PER DAY: _____<br>DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF |
|--|---|

**INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE  
SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN  
ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:**

YOU HAVE RECORDED \_\_\_\_\_.  
IS THIS CORRECT?

YES.....1  
NO .....2

**IF "NO," RETURN TO Q5, SELECT UNITS**



**IF Q2 = 3, DK OR REF (FORMER SMOKER) OR Q5 = DK OR REF (UNSPECIFIED DAILY AVERAGE), ASK:**

6. Did you smoke any cigarettes during the past 30 days?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

7. On how many of the past 30 days did you smoke cigarettes?  
 (INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS "EVERY DAY," RECORD 30)
- # OF DAYS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
8. During the past 30 days, on the days that you did smoke, about how many cigarettes did you usually smoke per day? (NOTE: 1 PACK = 20 CIGARETTES) (NOTE: "JUST A PUFF OR TWO" = 1 CIGARETTE)
- # OF CIGARETTES PER DAY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

9. About how old were you when you smoked your first whole cigarette? (INTERVIEWER: ENTER AGE IN YEARS)
- AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): \_\_\_\_\_  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
10. About how old were you when you first started smoking cigarettes fairly regularly? (INTERVIEWER: IF NEVER SMOKED REGULARLY, ENTER ZERO)
- AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): \_\_\_\_\_  
 NEVER SMOKED REGULARLY ..... 0  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
11. Were you smoking at all around this time 12 months ago?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

12. Were you smoking cigarettes every day or some days?
- EVERY DAY..... 1  
 SOME DAYS ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q2 = 3, DK OR REF (FORMER SMOKER), ASK:**

13. About how long has it been since you last smoked cigarettes regularly?
- YEARS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 1  
 MONTHS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 2  
 WEEKS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 3  
 DAYS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 4  
 TIME FRAME DOES NOT APPLY..... 5  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:

YOU HAVE RECORDED .....  
 IS THIS CORRECT?

YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2

IF "NO," RETURN TO Q13, SELECT UNITS

14. About how long has it been since you last had a smoke or a puff on a cigarette?
- YEARS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 1  
 MONTHS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 2  
 WEEKS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 3  
 DAYS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 4  
 TIME FRAME DOES NOT APPLY ..... 5  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED .....  
 REF

INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE  
 SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN  
 ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:

YOU HAVE RECORDED .....  
 IS THIS CORRECT?

YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2

IF "NO," RETURN TO Q14, SELECT UNITS

### ALTERNATIVE TOBACCO USE QUESTIONS

15. Have you ever used cigars, chewing tobacco, or snuff on a regular basis?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

IF YES, ASK:

16. Have you ever smoked cigars on a regular basis?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

IF YES, ASK:

17. Do you now smoke cigars every day, some days, or not at all?
- EVERY DAY ..... 1  
 SOME DAYS ..... 2  
 NOT AT ALL ..... 3  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

18. Have you ever used chewing tobacco on a regular basis?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

IF YES, ASK:

19. Do you now use chewing tobacco every day, some days, or not at all?
- EVERY DAY ..... 1  
 SOME DAYS ..... 2  
 NOT AT ALL ..... 3  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

20. Have you ever used snuff on a regular basis?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

IF YES, ASK:

21.	Do you now use snuff every day, some days, or not at all?	EVERY DAY.....1
		SOME DAYS .....2
		NOT AT ALL.....3
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**SMOKING CESSATION QUESTIONS**

**IF [Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR CURRENT REGULAR SMOKER)] OR [Q2 = 3, DK OR REF (FORMER SMOKER) AND Q14 < 12 MONTHS] (ALL SMOKERS EXCEPT FOR QUITTERS), ASK:**

22.	During the past 12 months, have you stopped smoking for 1 day or longer because you were trying to quit smoking?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q22 = 1 (TRIED TO QUIT), ASK:**

24.	I'd like to ask you about the last attempt you made to quit smoking. During that attempt, how long did you go without smoking a cigarette?	YEARS (ENTER #: _____).....1
		MONTHS (ENTER #: _____).....2
		WEEKS (ENTER #: _____).....3
		DAYS (ENTER #: _____).....4
		TIME FRAME DOES NOT APPLY.....5
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:	YES.....1
	NO .....2
YOU HAVE RECORDED _____.	IF "NO," RETURN TO Q24, SELECT UNITS
IS THIS CORRECT?	

**IF Q22 = 1 (TRIED TO QUIT) AND Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR CURRENT REGULAR SMOKER), ASK:**

25.	In what situation did you return to smoking? (INTERVIEWER: RECORD VERBATIM, ACCEPT BUT DO NOT PROBE FOR MULTIPLE RESPONSES.)	
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q22 = 1 (TRIED TO QUIT) OR Q14 ≥ 12 MONTHS, ASK:**

26.	In your last quit attempt, did you use medication such as patches, gum, Zyban, or nasal spray to help you quit?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF
27.	Did you use counseling advice in this quit attempt? (INTERVIEWER NOTE: "counseling advice" includes advice from any counseling professional, such as a therapist or clergy.)	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF
28.	Did you use any self-help materials in this quit attempt? (INTERVIEWER NOTE: "self-help materials" includes books, pamphlets, or Web sites designed for self-betterment.)	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF
28a.	Did you attend a smoking cessation group?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

28b.	For the purposes of this study we will use the abbreviation "LGBT" to mean "lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people." Was this group designed for LGBT people?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
------	---	---

**PROVIDER INTERVENTION QUESTIONS**

**IF [Q2 = 1 OR 2] OR [Q2 = 3, DK OR REF (FORMER SMOKER) AND Q14 < 12 MONTHS] (ALL SMOKERS EXCEPT FOR QUITTERS), ASK:**

29.	Did you see a doctor in the past 12 months?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	---	---

**IF YES, ASK:**

30.	In the last 12 months did a doctor suggest that you set a specific date to quit smoking?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	--	---

31.	In the last 12 months, did a doctor prescribe anything to help you to quit smoking?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	---	---

32.	In the last 12 months, did a doctor suggest that you receive any other assistance in quitting?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	--	---

**IF ANY OF Q30-32 =1 (DOCTOR ADVISED/ASSISTED QUIT ATTEMPT), ASK:**

33.	Did you try to quit when the doctor advised you to stop smoking?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	--	---

34.	Did you see a nurse or some health professional other than a medical doctor in the past 12 months?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	--	---

**IF YES, ASK:**

35.	In the last 12 months did a nurse or some other health professional advise you to stop smoking?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	---	---

**IF YES, ASK:**

36.	Did you try to quit when a nurse or other health professional advised you to stop smoking?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	--	---

**QUIT ATTEMPT QUESTIONS**

**IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY AND CURRENT REGULAR SMOKERS), ASK:**

39.	In your whole life, have you ever made a serious attempt to quit smoking?	YES.....1 NO .....2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF
-----	---	---

**IF YES, ASK:**

40. How long have you been smoking since your last quit attempt?
- YEARS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 1  
 MONTHS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 2  
 WEEKS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 3  
 DAYS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 4  
 TIME FRAME DOES NOT APPLY ..... 5  
 NEVER SMOKED AGAIN AFTER LAST  
 QUIT ATTEMPT ..... 6  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED .....  
 REF

**INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:**

YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2

**YOU HAVE RECORDED \_\_\_\_\_.** **IF "NO," RETURN TO Q40, SELECT UNITS**  
**IS THIS CORRECT?**

41. Since you started smoking regularly, what is the longest time you have ever gone without smoking a cigarette?
- YEARS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 1  
 MONTHS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 2  
 WEEKS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 3  
 DAYS (ENTER #: \_\_\_\_\_) ..... 4  
 TIME FRAME DOES NOT APPLY ..... 5  
 NEVER SMOKED REGULARLY ..... 6  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED .....  
 REF

**INTERVIEWER THEN ENTERS RESPONSE IN THE SELECTED UNIT FIELDS. THIS IS FOLLOWED BY AN ECHO FOR THE INTERVIEWER:**

YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2

**YOU HAVE RECORDED \_\_\_\_\_.** **IF "NO," RETURN TO Q41, SELECT UNITS**  
**IS THIS CORRECT?**

**LGBT SMOKING INTENTIONS QUESTIONS****IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY AND CURRENT REGULAR SMOKERS), ASK:**

42. Would you like to stop smoking?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF
43. Are you planning to quit smoking in the next 30 days?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF
44. Are you contemplating quitting smoking in the next six months?
- YES ..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

**LGBT SMOKING INTERVENTION PREFERENCES QUESTIONS****IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY AND CURRENT REGULAR SMOKERS), ASK:**

We are interested in your response to these next questions, even if you do not want to quit smoking.

**IF WAS NOT ASKED Q28b, SAY:**

For the purposes of this study we will use the abbreviation "LGBT" to mean "lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people."

45. If you were to seek outside help to quit smoking, would you... **(READ ITEMS)?**
- |                      |  |     |
|----------------------|--|-----|
|                      | <u>only</u> go to a program especially designed for LGBT people, .....   | 1   |
|                      | <u>only</u> go to a program that is inclusive of LGBT people but is not especially designed for LGBT people, ..... | 2   |
|                      | -or- go to any program that you knew to be effective.....  | 3   |
| <b>DO NOT READ</b> { | DON'T KNOW .....   | DK  |
|                      | REFUSED .....  | REF |

**FORMER SMOKERS' LIKELIHOOD OF RELAPSE QUESTIONS****IF Q2 = 3, DK, OR REF (FORMER SMOKERS), ASK:**

51. Do you think it is likely or unlikely that you will return to smoking in the next 12 months?
- |                                       |     |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| LIKELY .....                          | 1   |
| UNLIKELY .....                        | 2   |
| NEVER A REGULAR SMOKER (VOL. ONLY)... | 3   |
| DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....             | DK  |
| REFUSED .....                         | REF |
52. Do you think that there is any possible situation in which you might start smoking again?
- |                                       |     |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                              | 1   |
| NO .....                              | 2   |
| NEVER A REGULAR SMOKER (VOL. ONLY)... | 3   |
| DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....             | DK  |
| REFUSED .....                         | REF |

**SMOKING BRAND PREFERENCES****IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR CURRENT REGULAR SMOKERS), ASK:**

53. What brand do you usually smoke? **(DO NOT READ LIST) (ONLY ACCEPT ONE)**
- |                         |   |                |    |                                |     |
|-------------------------|---|----------------|----|--------------------------------|-----|
| BENSON AND HEDGES ..... | 1 | MARLBORO ..... | 7  | VANTAGE .....                  | 13  |
| CAMEL .....             | 2 | MERIT .....    | 8  | VIRGINIA SLIMS .....           | 14  |
| CARLTON .....           | 3 | MORE.....      | 9  | WINSTON .....                  | 15  |
| GENERIC .....           | 4 | NEWPORT .....  | 10 | OTHER ( <i>SPECIFY</i> ) ..... | 16  |
| KENT .....              | 5 | PALL MALL..... | 11 | DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....      | DK  |
| KOOL .....              | 6 | SALEM .....    | 12 | REFUSED .....                  | REF |

**SECOND-HAND SMOKE: WORKPLACE QUESTIONS**

Next, I would like to ask you a few questions about smoking in the workplace.

54. First, tell me which of the following statements apply to you... **(READ ALL BUT THE LAST RESPONSE)? (ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS)**

- |                      |  |     |
|----------------------|--|-----|
|                      | I am employed for wages .....                            | 1   |
|                      | I am self-employed .....                                 | 2   |
|                      | I am out of work and have been for more than 1 year..... | 3   |
|                      | I am out of work and have been for less than 1 year..... | 4   |
|                      | I am a homemaker.....                                    | 5   |
|                      | I am a student .....                                     | 6   |
|                      | I am retired .....                                       | 7   |
|                      | I am unable to work .....                                | 8   |
| <b>DO NOT READ</b> { | DON'T KNOW .....   | DK  |
|                      | REFUSED .....  | REF |

**IF AT LEAST ONE ANSWER TO Q54=1 OR 2 (EMPLOYED), ASK:**

55. Do you currently work at a location other than your own home?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

56. How many hours per week, on average, do you work at your job? Would you say... (READ CATEGORIES)? (IF NECESSARY: These are hours at your place of work.)
- 35 OR MORE HOURS PER WEEK ..... 1  
 20 TO 34 HOURS PER WEEK..... 2  
 LESS THAN 20 HOURS PER WEEK ..... 3  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
57. Do you work primarily indoors or outdoors?
- INDOORS..... 1  
 OUTDOORS ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q57 = 1, ASK:**

58. What best describes the location you currently work at...? (ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE ONLY)
- an office ..... 1  
 a plant or factory..... 2  
 a store or warehouse..... 3  
 a classroom ..... 4  
 a restaurant or bar ..... 5  
 -or- a vehicle..... 6  
 OTHER INDOOR SETTING (SPECIFY) ..... 8  
 DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW ..... DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

62. Is the building you work in completely smoke-free indoors?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DOES NOT WORK IN A BUILDING (VOL. ONLY) . 3  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
63. Is there an official policy that restricts smoking in any way at your work site?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
66. During the past two weeks has anyone smoked in the area in which you work?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**SECOND-HAND SMOKE: HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONS**

- Now a change of topic.
67. Have you ever been legally married?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q67 = 1 (BEEN MARRIED), ASK:**

68.	Are you... (READ CATEGORIES)?	CURRENTLY MARRIED.....1
		LEGALLY SEPARATED.....2
		LEGALLY DIVORCED, OR.....3
		WIDOWED.....4
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

DO NOT READ {

**IF Q67 = 2, DK OR REF OR Q68 = 2-4, DK OR REF, ASK:**

68b.	Do you currently have a primary partner? By primary partner I mean someone you love more than anyone else and feel a unique commitment to. (IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY HAVE MORE THAN ONE PRIMARY PARTNER, ASK THEM WHETHER THERE IS ONE THEY LOVE MORE THAN ANYONE ELSE AND FEEL A UNIQUE COMMITMENT TO. IF THEY STILL INSIST THAT THEY HAVE MORE THAN ONE, THEN PICK THE "NO" CATEGORY.)	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF 68b = 1 (HAS PARTNER), ASK:**

68c.	Is your primary partner someone of the same sex or the opposite sex?	SAME SEX .....1
		OPPOSITE SEX.....2
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q68 = 1 (CURRENTLY MARRIED) OR Q68b = 1 (HAS PARTNER), ASK:**

68d.	Do you and your (primary partner)(spouse) currently live together? (PROGRAMMER NOTE: USE "SPOUSE" IF R IS CURRENTLY LEGALLY MARRIED)	YES.....1
		NO, OR .....2
		SOMETIMES TOGETHER/SOMETIMES APART 3
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF 68d = 1 (LIVE TOGETHER), ASK:**

68e.	About how many years have you and your (spouse)(partner) lived together in the same place? (IF MORE THAN 1 YEAR, ROUND TO NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER OF YEARS. IF LESS THAN 1 YEAR, USE 2 <sup>ND</sup> RESPONSE CATEGORY.)	# OF YEARS: .....1
		LESS THAN 1 YEAR .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

  

68f.	About how long have you and your (partner) (spouse) been (together in the relationship) (married)? (IF MORE THAN 1 YEAR, ROUND TO NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER OF YEARS. IF LESS THAN 1 YEAR, USE 2 <sup>ND</sup> RESPONSE CATEGORY.)	# OF YEARS: .....1
		LESS THAN 1 YEAR .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q68c = 1 AND Q68d = 1 (NOT CURRENTLY MARRIED BUT HAVE THE SAME GENDER PRIMARY PARTNER AND LIVE TOGETHER), ASK:**

68g.	Is your domestic partnership registered with either local or state government?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF



**IF Q68b = 1 OR Q68 = 1 (HAS PARTNER OR CURRENTLY MARRIED), ASK:**

69.	Does your (spouse)(partner) currently smoke?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF 69 = 2, DK OR REF (PARTNER/SPOUSE NOT CURRENT SMOKER), ASK:**

70.	Is this person a former smoker?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

70a.	Do you live with anyone else?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q70a = 1 (LIVES WITH OTHERS), ASK:**

71.	Does anyone else living in the household smoke cigarettes now?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

72.	How many household members currently smoke, not including yourself?	# OF SMOKERS IN HH: .....1
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

73.	About what proportion of your friends smoke? Would you say... (READ CATEGORIES)?	NONE .....1
		LESS THAN ONE QUARTER (25%).....2
		BETWEEN A QUARTER AND A HALF (26%-50%).....3
		OVER HALF (51%) .....4
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

DO NOT READ {

**IF Q73 = 2, 3, 4, DK OR REF, ASK:**

74.	Do any of your friends who smoke ever say that they should quit smoking?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		NONE OF MY FRIENDS SMOKE .....3
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q69 = 1 (PARTNER OR SPOUSE SMOKES CURRENTLY), ASK:**

75.	Does your (spouse)(partner) ever say that he/she should quit smoking?	YES.....1
		NO .....2
		MY PARTNER DOESN'T SMOKE.....3
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
		REFUSED .....REF

76. What are the smoking rules or restrictions in your household, if any? Would you say... **(READ CATEGORIES)?**
- SMOKING IS COMPLETELY PROHIBITED ..... 1  
 SMOKING IS GENERALLY PROHIBITED,  
 WITH FEW EXCEPTIONS ..... 2  
 SMOKING IS ALLOWED IN SOME ROOMS  
 ONLY ..... 3  
 THERE ARE NO RESTRICTIONS ON SMOKING. 4  
**DO NOT** OTHER (**VOLUNTEERED ONLY**)  
 (*SPECIFY*) ..... 5  
**READ** { DON'T KNOW ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF
77. Does anyone ever smoke inside your home?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

### SECONDHAND SMOKE: OTHER QUESTIONS

78. Are you often exposed to other people's tobacco smoke at any other place besides your home and your workplace?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

#### IF YES, ASK:

79. What are those places? (**PROBE:**) Any others?  
**(INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR MULTIPLE RESPONSES AND ACCEPT UP TO 3)**
- (TEXT) .....  
 (TEXT) .....  
 (TEXT) .....  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

80. In the past week, about how long were you exposed to other people's tobacco smoke. Please think about all the different environments you were in. Would you say not at all, 1-9 minutes, 10-29 minutes, 30 – 59 minutes, 1 to 3 hours, or more than 3 hours?
- NOT AT ALL..... 1  
 1-9 MINUTES ..... 2  
 10-29 MINUTES ..... 3  
 30-59 MINUTES ..... 4  
 1 TO 3 HOURS ..... 5  
 MORE THAN 3 HOURS ..... 6  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

### ADVERTISEMENT AND PROMOTION QUESTIONS

I know you are a (non-smoker but)(smoker, and) I would like your opinions on the following items.

81. Have you ever seen a cigarette advertisement in a magazine?
- YES..... 1  
 NO ..... 2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE ..... DK  
 REFUSED ..... REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

82. Think back to the cigarette advertisements you have recently seen in magazines. What brand of cigarettes was advertised the most? **(DO NOT READ LIST)**

BENSON AND HEDGES.....	1	PALL MALL.....	11
CAMEL .....	2	SALEM .....	12
CARLTON.....	3	VANTAGE .....	13
GENERIC .....	4	VIRGINIA SLIMS.....	14
KENT .....	5	WINSTON .....	15
KOOL .....	6	OTHER ( <i>SPECIFY</i> ) .....	16
MARLBORO.....	7	NONE.....	17
MERIT.....	8		
MORE.....	9	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE.....	DK
NEWPORT .....	10	REFUSED .....	REF

83. Do you believe that these advertisements were specifically designed to appeal to lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender individuals?

YES.....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

85. In the past 12 months have you received a free sample of cigarettes or any other tobacco products?

YES.....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

**IF YES, ASK:****IF WAS NOT ASKED Q28b OR 45, SAY:**

For the purposes of this study we will use the abbreviation "LGBT" to mean "lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people."

86. Did you receive any of these samples at a LGBT identified location or event?

YES.....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

Some tobacco companies offer promotional items, such as clothing and bags, which have the company brand name or logo on them.

87. In the past 12 months, have you purchased or received for free any item with a tobacco brand name or logo on it?

YES.....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

**IF YES TO Q87 ASK:**

90. How did you obtain the most recent promotional item that you have? **(DO NOT READ) (PRE-CODED OPEN END)**

HANDOUT AT A FAIR, FESTIVAL, OR EVENT .	1
GIFT FROM FRIEND OR RELATIVE .....	2
RECEIVED AS PRIZE IN A GAME .....	3
FROM SENDING IN COUPONS OR PARTS OF A TOBACCO PACKAGE .....	4
FOUND .....	5
AS PART OF A CIGARETTE PURCHASE .....	6
OTHER ( <i>SPECIFY</i> ) .....	7
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

**ASSERTING NON-SMOKING RIGHTS QUESTIONS**

93. How annoying do you find other people's smoking? Would you say not annoying at all, a little annoying, moderately annoying, very annoying, or extremely annoying?
- NOT ANNOYING AT ALL ..... 1  
 A LITTLE ANNOYING.....2  
 MODERATELY ANNOYING .....3  
 VERY ANNOYING .....4  
 EXTREMELY ANNOYING .....5  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
94. In the past 12 months have you ever asked someone not to smoke?
- YES..... 1  
 NO .....2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

95. On the most recent occasion you asked someone not to smoke, who was that person? (DO NOT READ) (PRE-CODED OPEN END)
- SPOUSE OR PARTNER ..... 1  
 PARENT.....2  
 CHILD.....3  
 OTHER RELATIVE .....4  
 FRIEND.....5  
 COWORKER.....6  
 OTHER KNOWN PERSON.....7  
 STRANGER .....8  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
96. On that same occasion, what was the primary reason you asked that person not to smoke? (DO NOT READ) (PRE-CODED OPEN END)
- SMOKE WAS ANNOYING TO YOU ..... 1  
 CONCERNED ABOUT LONG-TERM HEALTH EFFECTS OF SECOND-HAND SMOKE.....2  
 SMOKING WAS ILLEGAL .....3  
 CONCERNED ABOUT THE SMOKER'S HEALTH4  
 CONCERNED ABOUT YOUR OWN HEALTH (RESPONDENT'S HEALTH).....5  
 BECAUSE THERE'S NO SMOKING ALLOWED IN THE HOUSEHOLD.....6  
 OTHER (SPECIFY) .....7  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR CURRENT REGULAR SMOKER), ASK:**

97. About how many times in the past 12 months has anyone asked you not to smoke when you were smoking or about to smoke? Would you say never, once or twice, several times, or many times?
- NEVER ..... 1  
 ONCE OR TWICE .....2  
 SEVERAL TIMES .....3  
 MANY TIMES .....4  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**ANTI-TOBACCO MESSAGES QUESTIONS**

98. Within the last 30 days, have you seen or heard any anti-tobacco messages?
- YES..... 1  
 NO .....2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:****IF WAS NOT ASKED Q28b, Q45 OR Q86, SAY:**

For the purposes of this study we will use the abbreviation "LGBT" to mean "lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people."

99. Did you ... (READ ITEMS)?

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>REF</u>
a. see anti-tobacco messages in an LGBT magazine .....	1	2	DK	REF
b. See anti-tobacco messages in an LGBT newspaper.....	1	2	DK	REF
c. See or hear anti-tobacco messages in media directed to everyone .....	1	2	DK	REF

100. Did any of these messages especially appeal to you?

YES.....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

100a. Do you think any of these messages are especially appealing to LGBT people, as a group?

YES.....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

**ATTITUDES ABOUT SMOKING QUESTIONS**

Now, I'm going to read you a few statements about smoking. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following... (READ QUESTIONS IN RANDOM ORDER) Do you agree or disagree?

AGREE   DISAGREE   DK   REF

**IF Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR CURRENT REGULAR SMOKER), ASK:**

( ) 101. I rarely smoke when I am the only smoker in a group.....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 102. Inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette causes lung cancer in a nonsmoker .....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 103. Inhaling second-hand smoke from someone else's cigarette harms the health of babies and children .....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 105. Tobacco advertising encourages young people to start smoking.....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 106. Tobacco companies could lower the nicotine content of tobacco products if they wanted to .....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 108. The ban on cigarette advertising should be extended to all media.....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 109. Tobacco products should be regulated as a drug by a government agency such as the Food and Drug Administration .....	1	2	DK	REF
( ) 110. The production and sale of cigarettes should not be legally allowed in the United States .....	1	2	DK	REF
111. How much, if any, additional tax on a pack of cigarettes would you be willing to support if all the money raised was used to fund programs aimed at preventing smoking among children, and other health care programs? I am going to read you a list – after I read it, please tell me the highest tax you are willing to support. (READ ITEMS IN ORDER)	NO TAX INCREASE.....	1		
	25 CENTS A PACK .....	2		
	50 CENTS A PACK .....	3		
	75 CENTS A PACK .....	4		
	A DOLLAR A PACK .....	5		
	TWO DOLLARS A PACK .....	6		
	MORE THAN TWO DOLLARS A PACK.....	7		
	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK		
	REFUSED .....	REF		

DO NOT READ {

112. How much do you agree or disagree with the following? (READ ITEMS IN RANDOM ORDER, ASKING:) Do you agree or disagree? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR INTENSITY OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT)

	STRONGLY AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
( ) a. Smoking is a bigger health problem for gay/bisexual men than for men in general.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) b. Smoking is a bigger health problem for lesbian/bisexual women than for women in general .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) c. Smoking is a bigger health problem for transgendered or transsexual people than for people in general.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) d. Non-smokers are <u>more</u> attractive to you than smokers .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) e. Someone who quits smoking will probably gain weight.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF

IF WAS NOT ASKED Q28b, Q45, Q86 OR Q99, SAY:

For the purposes of this study we will use the abbreviation "LGBT" to mean "lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people."

( ) h. Tobacco companies target LGBT people in their advertising and promotional efforts.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) j. Anti-smoking campaigns ignore the LGBT community.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) k. LGBT organizations should not accept money from tobacco companies.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF

### SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, ORIENTATION AND ATTRACTION QUESTIONS

Now some questions about your sexuality ...

113. Have you ever had sex of any kind with another (man)(woman)? (PROGRAMMER NOTE: USE "MAN" IF R IS MALE, WOMAN IF FEMALE)	YES.....	1
	NO .....	2
	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
	REFUSED .....	REF

IF YES, ASK:

114. Have you had sex with another (man)(woman) in the last 12 months?	YES.....	1
	NO .....	2
	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
	REFUSED .....	REF

IF NO, DK, OR REF, ASK:

115. Has it been in the last 5 years?	YES.....	1
	NO .....	2
	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
	REFUSED .....	REF

IF NO, DK OR REF, ASK:

116. Has it been since the age of 18?	YES.....	1
	NO .....	2
	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
	REFUSED .....	REF

IF NO, DK OR REF, ASK:	
117. Has it been since sometime <u>before</u> the age of 18?	YES..... 1 NO ..... 2 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK REFUSED .....REF

118. Do you currently identify yourself as...  
(READ CATEGORIES; ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE ONLY)?
- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
|                    | GAY, ..... 1   |
|                    | LESBIAN, (ONLY FOR FEMALE) ..... 2                                   |
|                    | BISEXUAL, ..... 3  |
|                    | HETEROSEXUAL, ..... 4  |
|                    | OR DOES ANOTHER TERM BETTER DESCRIBE YOU? ( <i>SPECIFY</i> ) ..... 5 |
| VOLUNTEERED ONLY { | QUEER ..... 6  |
|                    | QUESTIONING ..... 7  |
|                    | DO NOT LIKE LABELS/NO LABEL ..... 8                                  |
|                    | TRANSGENDER/TRANSSEXUAL ..... 9                                      |
| DO NOT READ {      | HOMOSEXUAL ..... 10  |
|                    | DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  |
|                    | REFUSED .....REF   |

IF Q118 = 1-8, DK, OR REF, ASK:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 119. Do you consider yourself to be transgendered or transsexual in any way? By this I mean do you have a gender identity or presentation that is different from what society says you should have for your birth sex? (IF NECESSARY, SAY: We are asking this question of everyone.) | YES..... 1<br>NO ..... 2<br>DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF |
|--|---|

IF Q118 = 9 OR Q119 = 1 (VOLUNTEERED OR ANSWERED TRANS), ASK:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 119a. What sex were you assigned at birth?  | MALE..... 1<br>FEMALE ..... 2<br>INTERSEX (VOLUNTEERED ONLY) ..... 3<br>REFUSED .....REF   |
| 119b. What is your current gender presentation? Do you look like a... (READ FIRST 4 RESPONSES)? | MAN ALL THE TIME, ..... 1<br>WOMAN ALL THE TIME, ..... 2<br>MAN SOMETIMES, A WOMAN AT OTHER TIMES, OR ..... 3<br>A BLENDING OF GENDERS (ANDROGYNY) ... 4<br>VOLUNTEERED ONLY → OTHER ( <i>SPECIFY</i> ) ..... 5<br>DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK<br>REFUSED .....REF |
| 119c. What sex is currently listed on your drivers license or government issued ID?             | MALE..... 1<br>FEMALE ..... 2<br>HAS NO LICENSE OR ID ..... 3<br>REFUSED .....REF  |
| 119d. What sex is currently listed on your birth certificate?                                   | MALE..... 1<br>FEMALE ..... 2<br>HAS NO BIRTH CERTIFICATE ..... 3<br>REFUSED .....REF  |
| 119e. Do you currently use hormones for the purpose of changing your gender presentation?       | YES..... 1<br>NO ..... 2<br>REFUSED .....REF   |

**IF YES, ASK:**

119f. Do you use estrogen or testosterone?	ESTROGEN.....1
	TESTOSTERONE .....2
	OTHER ( <i>SPECIFY</i> ).....3
	DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK
	REFUSED .....REF

120. How would you describe your current feelings of sexual attraction? Are you... (**READ ITEMS**)? (**REVERSE ORDER OF RESPONSES FOR FEMALE**)

	only attracted to males, .....1
	mainly attracted to males, .....2
	equally attracted to males and females, .....3
	mainly attracted to females, .....4
	-or- only attracted to females .....5
<b>DO NOT READ</b> {	DON'T KNOW .....DK
	REFUSED .....REF

121. Now I'd like to ask you some questions about growing up and your sexual feelings when you were younger. At about what age were you first sexually attracted to another (male)(female)?
- |                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): ..... | 1   |
| NEVER .....                   | 2   |
| DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....     | DK  |
| REFUSED .....                 | REF |
122. At about what age did you have your first relationship with another (male)(female)? By first relationship, I mean the first time that you became emotionally involved with someone you were attracted to or were having sex with.
- |                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): ..... | 1   |
| NEVER .....                   | 2   |
| DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....     | DK  |
| REFUSED .....                 | REF |

**IF Q118 = 9 OR Q119 = 1 (VOLUNTEERED OR ANSWERED TRANS), ASK:**

- 124a. At what age did you first wonder whether you might be transgendered or transsexual?
- |                                 |                             |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): .....   | 1                           |
| I DON'T LIKE TO USE LABELS..... | 2                           |
| NEVER .....                     | 3                           |
| <b>VOLUNTEERED ONLY</b> {       | DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK |
|                                 | REFUSED .....REF            |
- 124b. At what age did you first decide that you were transgendered or transsexual?
- |                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): ..... | 1   |
| NEVER .....                   | 2   |
| DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....     | DK  |
| REFUSED .....                 | REF |

**DISCLOSURE QUESTIONS****IF Q114 = 1, Q115 = 1, OR Q118 = 1-3, 6, 10 (GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL QUEER OR HOMOSEXUAL, OR REPORTED SAME GENDER SEXUAL PARTNERS IN LAST FIVE YEARS OR LESS), ASK:**

125. Some people are very open about their sexual orientation while others are not. I would like you to tell me how many people know that you (are gay)(are lesbian)(are bisexual) (have sex with men)(have sex with women). (**PROGRAMMER: VARY WORDING HERE – IF Q118 = 1 THEN GAY, IF Q118 = 2 THEN LESBIAN, IF Q118 = 3 THEN BISEXUAL, IF Q118 = 6 THEN QUEER. IF NONE OF THESE, AND RESPONDENT IS MALE, THEN “HAVE SEX WITH MEN;” IF FEMALE, “HAVE SEX WITH WOMEN.”**)

Let's start with your friends. At present, about how many of your friends know that you (are gay) (are lesbian) (are bisexual) (are queer) (have sex with men) (have sex with women)... (**READ CATEGORIES**)?

	ALL OF YOUR FRIENDS, .....1
	ALMOST ALL, .....2
	ABOUT HALF, .....3
	LESS THAN HALF, OR .....4
	NONE OF THEM .....5
<b>DO NOT READ</b> {	I DON'T HAVE ANY FRIENDS ( <b>VOL. ONLY</b> )....6
	DON'T KNOW .....DK
	REFUSED .....REF



126.	About how many of your <u>family members</u> know that you (are gay) (are lesbian) (are bisexual) (are queer) (have sex with men) (have sex with women)... (READ CATEGORIES)?	ALL OF YOUR FAMILY MEMBERS,.....1 ALMOST ALL, .....2 ABOUT HALF, .....3 LESS THAN HALF, OR .....4 NONE OF THEM .....5 FAMILY DECEASED/HAVE NO FAMILY (VOL. ONLY) .....6 DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW .....DK REFUSED .....REF
127.	About how many of your <u>coworkers</u> know that you (are gay) (are lesbian) (are bisexual) (are queer) (have sex with men) (have sex with women)... (READ CATEGORIES)?	ALL OF YOUR COWORKERS, .....1 ALMOST ALL, .....2 ABOUT HALF, .....3 LESS THAN HALF, OR .....4 NONE OF THEM .....5 NOT APPLICABLE (VOL. ONLY) .....6 DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW .....DK REFUSED .....REF

**IF Q118 = 9 OR Q119 = 1 (VOLUNTEERED OR ANSWERED TRANS), ASK:**

129a.	Some people are very open about being transgendered or transsexual while others are not. I would like you to tell me how many people know that you are transgendered or transsexual.  Let's start with your friends. At present, about how many of your friends know that you are transgendered or transsexual... (READ CATEGORIES)?	ALL OF YOUR FRIENDS, .....1 ALMOST ALL, .....2 ABOUT HALF, .....3 LESS THAN HALF, OR .....4 NONE OF THEM .....5 I DON'T HAVE ANY FRIENDS (VOL. ONLY) ....6 DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW .....DK REFUSED .....REF
129b.	About how many of your <u>family members</u> know that you are transgendered or transsexual... (READ CATEGORIES)?	ALL OF YOUR FAMILY MEMBERS,.....1 ALMOST ALL, .....2 ABOUT HALF, .....3 LESS THAN HALF, OR .....4 NONE OF THEM .....5 FAMILY DECEASED/HAVE NO FAMILY (VOL. ONLY) .....6 DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW .....DK REFUSED .....REF
129c.	About how many of your <u>coworkers</u> know that you are transgendered or transsexual... (READ CATEGORIES)?	ALL OF YOUR COWORKERS, .....1 ALMOST ALL, .....2 ABOUT HALF, .....3 LESS THAN HALF, OR .....4 NONE OF THEM .....5 NOT APPLICABLE (VOL. ONLY) .....6 DO NOT READ { DON'T KNOW .....DK REFUSED .....REF

**SOCIAL NETWORKS/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS**

130. In the last 12 months, about how often have you done any of the following? (READ FIRST STATEMENT, THEN ASK:) Would you say frequently, occasionally, rarely or never? (DO NOT ROTATE) (IF NECESSARY: In the last 12 months, about how often have you...)

	<u>FREQ.</u>	<u>OCCAS.</u>	<u>RARELY</u>	<u>NEVER</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>REF</u>
a. visited LGBT chat rooms, Web sites or list servers .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
b. read LGBT newspapers or magazines .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
c. gone to LGBT bars or clubs .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
d. gone to LGBT bathhouses or sex clubs .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
e. attended events sponsored by an LGBT organization of any kind.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
f. volunteered time for an LGBT organization.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
g. contributed money to an LGBT organization.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF

Tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following... (READ ITEMS). (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT AS INDICATED) Would you say you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

	<u>STRONGLY</u> <u>AGREE</u>	<u>SOMEWHA</u> <u>T</u> <u>AGREE</u>	<u>NEITHER</u>	<u>SOMEWHA</u> <u>T</u> <u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>STRONGLY</u> <u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>REF</u>
131. I feel like I am a part of the LGBT community .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF

**DISCRIMINATION AND VIOLENCE QUESTIONS**

Now, I'd like to ask you about crime. In the last 12 months... (READ ITEMS)? (NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT BECOMES EMOTIONALLY UPSET BY THESE QUESTIONS, SAY: "I understand that these questions might be difficult for you. If you wish, we can skip to the next question or next topic.")

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>REF</u>
133a. Has someone called you names or verbally assaulted you in public? .....	1	2	DK	REF
<b>IF YES, ASK:</b>				
133b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? .....	1	2	DK	REF
134a. Has your personal property been purposely damaged or destroyed? .....	1	2	DK	REF
<b>IF YES, ASK:</b>				
134b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? .....	1	2	DK	REF
135a. Have you been hit, beaten or physically attacked? .....	1	2	DK	REF
<b>IF YES, ASK:</b>				
135b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? .....	1	2	DK	REF
136a. Have you been assaulted or wounded with a weapon? .....	1	2	DK	REF
<b>IF YES, ASK:</b>				
136b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? .....	1	2	DK	REF
137a. Have you been raped or sexually assaulted? .....	1	2	DK	REF
<b>IF YES, ASK:</b>				
137b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? .....	1	2	DK	REF

138a. Has someone thrown an object or objects at you? ..... YES ..... NO ..... DK ..... REF  
 1 ..... 2 ..... DK ... REF

IF YES, ASK:

138b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? ..... 1 ..... 2 ..... DK ... REF

139a. Has someone chased or followed you? ..... 1 ..... 2 ..... DK ... REF

IF YES, ASK:

139b. Was this because you were perceived to be LGBT? ..... 1 ..... 2 ..... DK ... REF

### INTERNALIZED HOMOPHOBIA QUESTIONS

IF Q114 = 1, Q115 = 1, OR Q118 = 1-3, 6, 10 (GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL, QUEER OR HOMOSEXUAL, OR REPORTED SAME GENDER SEXUAL PARTNERS IN LAST FIVE YEARS OR LESS), ASK:

141. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. (READ ITEMS IN RANDOM ORDER) (INTERVIEWER: ASK WHETHER THEY AGREE/DISAGREE. IF AGREE/DISAGREE, GET WHETHER IT IS STRONGLY, MODERATELY OR SLIGHTLY) (NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT BECOMES EMOTIONALLY UPSET BY THESE QUESTIONS, SAY: "I understand that these questions might be difficult for you. If you wish, we can skip to the next question or next topic.")

	AGREE			DISAGREE			DK	REF
	STR.	MOD.	SLI.	SLI.	MOD.	STR.		
( ) a. Sometimes I dislike myself for (being gay) (being lesbian) (being bisexual) (being queer) (having sex with men) (having sex with women).....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF
ASK IF Q118 = 1-3, 5-10, DK OR REF:								
( ) b. I wish I were heterosexual.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF
( ) c. I am glad (to be gay) (to be lesbian) (to be bisexual) (to be queer) (I have sex with men) (I have sex with women) .....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF
( ) d. I am proud to be part of the LGBT community.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF

### INTERNALIZED TRANSPHOBIA QUESTIONS

IF Q118 = 9 OR Q119 = 1 (VOLUNTEERED OR ANSWERED TRANS), ASK:

141a. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. (READ ITEMS IN RANDOM ORDER) (INTERVIEWER: ASK WHETHER THEY AGREE/DISAGREE. IF AGREE/DISAGREE, GET WHETHER IT IS STRONGLY, MODERATELY OR SLIGHTLY) (NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT BECOMES EMOTIONALLY UPSET BY THESE QUESTIONS, SAY: "I understand that these questions might be difficult for you. If you wish, we can skip to the next question or next topic.")

	AGREE			DISAGREE			DK	REF
	STR.	MOD.	SLI.	SLI.	MOD.	STR.		
( ) a. Sometimes I dislike myself for being transgendered or transsexual .....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF
( ) b. I wish I were more gender conforming.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF
( ) c. I am glad to be transgendered or transsexual.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF
( ) d. I am proud to be part of the transgender community.....	1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....	6.....	DK.....	REF

**HIV QUESTIONS**

142. Have you ever been tested for HIV, the virus that causes AIDS?
- YES.....1  
 NO .....2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

143. When was the most recent time you were tested and received the results?
- MONTH/YEAR: \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_. 1  
 NEVER GOT RESULT.....2  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**IF MONTH/YEAR GIVEN, DK, OR REF, ASK:**

144. What were the results of this test?
- HIV-NEGATIVE .....1  
 HIV-POSITIVE .....2  
 INCONCLUSIVE OR UNREADABLE .....3  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF

**HIV AND SMOKING QUESTIONS****IF Q144 = 2 (HIV-POSITIVE) AND Q2 = 1 OR 2 (CURRENT DAILY OR REGULAR SMOKER) ASK:**

145. Does your HIV status affect how concerned you are about your smoking? Would you say... (READ CATEGORIES)?
- MORE CONCERNED.....1  
 LESS CONCERNED .....2  
 DOESN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE .....3  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
- DO NOT READ {
146. If you were to go to a group to quit smoking, how important would it be for you to go to a group solely for HIV-positives... (READ CATEGORIES)?
- VERY IMPORTANT .....1  
 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT.....2  
 NOT VERY IMPORTANT .....3  
 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT .....4  
 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
 REFUSED .....REF
- DO NOT READ {

**LIFE EVENTS QUESTIONS**

147. Did you experience any of the following events in the past year (ACCEPT UP TO 3 OTHERS)? (READ ITEMS) (IF NECESSARY: Did you experience this in the past year?)
- |   | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>DK</u> | <u>REF</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| a. your spouse or partner died .....  | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| b. your relationship with your spouse or partner ended .....                                | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| d. you were diagnosed with a major illness .....  | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| e. your spouse or partner was diagnosed with a major illness .....                          | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| f. you came out to others as a LGBT person.....   | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| f1. you became unemployed.....  | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| f2. you moved your residence .....  | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |
| g. Did you experience any (other) stressful event(s) in the past 12 months? (SPECIFY) _____ |            |           |           |            |
| (PROGRAMMER: INSERT "OTHER" IF YES TO Q147a, b, d, e, f, f1, or f2).....                    | 1          | 2         | DK        | REF        |

**PERCEIVED STRESS QUESTIONS**

148. Now I want to ask you about some specific feelings, thoughts and activities that you may have experienced during the last month. For each of the following things, tell me how often you experienced it using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means never or almost never, and 5 means very often. **(READ ITEM IN RANDOM ORDER, ASKING:)** On a scale of 1-5, in the last month how often have you experienced this? (NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT BECOMES EMOTIONALLY UPSET BY THESE QUESTIONS, SAY: "I understand that these questions might be difficult for you. If you wish, we can skip to the next question or next topic.")

	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
	←—————→						
( ) a. been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) b. felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life.....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) c. felt nervous and stressed .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) d. felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) e. felt that things were going your way.....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) f. found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) g. been able to control irritations in your life.....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) h. felt that you were on top of things .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) i. been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
( ) j. felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them .....	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF

**DEPRESSION QUESTIONS**

149. Now I would like to ask about how you've been feeling over the last week. Thinking about the past 7 days, how often... **(READ ITEMS IN RANDOM ORDER, ASKING:)** Was it less than one day, 1-2 days, 3-4 days, or 5-7 days? (NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT BECOMES EMOTIONALLY UPSET BY THESE QUESTIONS, SAY: "I understand that these questions might be difficult for you. If you wish, we can skip to the next question or next topic.")

	<1 DAY	1-2 DAYS	3-4 DAYS	5-7 DAYS	DK	REF
( ) a. was your sleep restless.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) b. did you talk less than usual.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) c. did you feel that you could not shake off the blues even with help from your family or friends.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) d. did you feel that you were not as good as other people .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) e. did you have trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) f. did you feel depressed.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) g. did you feel that everything you did was an effort .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) h. did you feel that people were unfriendly.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) i. did you enjoy your life .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) j. did you feel sad .....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF
( ) k. did you feel that people disliked you.....	1	2	3	4	DK	REF

150. Have you taken any medication for depression in the past year?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF
151. Have you seen a therapist for depression in the past year?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**ALCOHOL USE QUESTIONS**

152. The next questions are about use of alcohol. In the past 6 months, on average, how often did you drink any kind of alcoholic drink? Would you say... (READ CATEGORIES)?
- NEVER, .....1  
ABOUT ONCE A MONTH, .....2  
2 OR 3 TIMES A MONTH, .....3  
1 OR 2 TIMES A WEEK, .....4  
3 OR 4 TIMES A WEEK, .....5  
NEARLY EVERY DAY, OR .....6  
AT LEAST ONCE A DAY.....7  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF
- DO NOT READ {

**IF Q152 = 2-7 (RESPONDENT HAS DRUNK ALCOHOL AT LEAST ONCE IN PAST SIX MONTHS), ASK:**

153. In the past 6 months, on a day when you drank some alcohol, how many drinks did you usually have? By "drink" I mean an equivalent of one 4-ounce glass of wine, a 12-ounce can or bottle of beer or a drink with a one and a half ounce shot of hard liquor.
- ENTER # OF DRINKS: .....1  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

154. Have you ever been concerned about your use of alcohol?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, HAVE BEEN CONCERNED ABOUT ALCOHOL, ASK:**

155. In the past 6 months, tell me whether you have had any of the following experiences and if so how often. (READ ITEMS IN RANDOM ORDER, ASKING:) In the last six months has this happened to you not at all, once, 2-3 times, or 4 or more times? (NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT BECOMES EMOTIONALLY UPSET BY THESE QUESTIONS, SAY: "I understand that these questions might be difficult for you. If you wish, we can skip to the next question or next topic.")
- |   | NOT AT<br>ALL | ONCE | 2-3<br>TIMES | 4+<br>TIMES | DK | REF |
|---|---------------|------|--------------|-------------|----|-----|
| ( ) a. been afraid you might be too dependent on alcohol.....   | 1             | 2    | 3            | 4           | DK | REF |
| ( ) b. felt you needed a few drinks to change your mood or make you more comfortable and relaxed with other people..... | 1             | 2    | 3            | 4           | DK | REF |
| ( ) c. found that once you started drinking, you couldn't stop until you were drunk or very high.....                   | 1             | 2    | 3            | 4           | DK | REF |
| ( ) d. found that you needed a drink in the morning to relieve a hangover.....  | 1             | 2    | 3            | 4           | DK | REF |
| ( ) e. had problems or serious conflicts with a lover, partner or close friend over your drinking.....                  | 1             | 2    | 3            | 4           | DK | REF |
| ( ) f. lost a job because of drinking.....  | 1             | 2    | 3            | 4           | DK | REF |

**DRUG USE QUESTIONS**

156. Many people have tried drugs such as marijuana, poppers, or party drugs for recreational purposes at some point in their lives; others have not. In the past 6 months have you used any drugs for recreational purposes?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

157. In the past 6 months have you used... (READ ITEMS a-i IN RANDOM ORDER; READ k LAST)?
- |  | YES | NO | DK | REF |
|--|-----|----|----|-----|
| ( ) a. Marijuana, also known as pot, hash or THC.....  | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) b. poppers or inhalants like glue or paint .....   | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) c. prescription medication differently than prescribed by a physician .....                    | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) d. cocaine or crack cocaine.....   | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) e. methamphetamines, also known as speed, crystal or crank, or other "uppers" .....            | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) f. Ecstasy, also known as MDMA, or other forms of MDA .....                                    | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) g. psychedelics or/ hallucinogens, such as LSD, mescaline, PCP, or angel dust.....             | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) h. downers including barbiturates, tranquilizers like Valium, or sedatives like Quaaludes..... | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| ( ) x. heroin, other opiates, or painkillers like Demerol.....                                     | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |
| k. other "party drugs," such as Special K (or ketamine) or GHB (SPECIFY) .....                     | 1   | 2  | DK | REF |

158. Have you ever injected any recreational drugs?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

159. When was the last time?
- MONTH/YEAR: \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_. 1  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

160. Have you ever been concerned about your use of recreational drugs?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**IF YES, ASK:**

161. Are you still concerned?
- YES.....1  
NO .....2  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**SOCIODEMOGRAPHICS**

162. What is your age, please?
- AGE (ENTER # OF YEARS): \_\_\_\_\_  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

**IF DK OR REF, ASK:**

163.	Are you between ages of... (READ CATEGORIES)?	18-24 YEARS .....	1
		25-29 YEARS .....	2
		30-44 YEARS .....	3
		45-55 YEARS .....	4
		56-64 YEARS, OR .....	5
		ARE YOU 65 YEARS OR OLDER .....	6
		DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
		REFUSED .....	REF

164. What was the highest grade or year of school that you completed? (DO NOT READ CATEGORIES)

NO FORMAL SCHOOLING .....	1
ELEMENTARY OR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (1-8 YEARS) .....	2
SOME HIGH SCHOOL (9-12 YEARS) .....	3
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR GED EQUIVALENT .....	4
SOME COLLEGE OR POST-HIGH SCHOOL (13 OR MORE YEARS/AA DEGREE) .....	5
BA/BS DEGREE .....	6
BA/BS DEGREE + SOME GRADUATE SCHOOL .....	7
MA/MS, PH.D., OR OTHER GRADUATE DEGREE .....	8
OTHER (SPECIFY) .....	9
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

165. Are you Hispanic or Latino(a)?

YES .....	1
NO .....	2
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

166. Which of the following categories best describes your racial background? Are you...? (ONLY ACCEPT ONE)

WHITE .....	1
BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN .....	2
JAPANESE .....	3
CHINESE .....	4
FILIPINO .....	5
KOREAN .....	6
OTHER ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER, OR ....	7
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE .....	8
MEXICAN .....	9
HISPANIC .....	10
OTHER (SPECIFY) .....	11
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

VOLUNTEERED ONLY {

DO NOT READ {

168. In studies like this, households are sometimes grouped according to income. Please tell me which of the following groups best describes the total combined pre-tax income of all persons in this household over the past year. Please include income from all sources, such as salaries, interest, retirement, or disability for all household members. Would you say.. (READ CATEGORIES)?

(IF NECESSARY, ADD: Include income from all sources such as:  
earnings; social security and public assistance payments;  
dividends, interest and rent; unemployment and worker's  
compensation; government and private employee pensions.)

\$10,000 OR LESS .....	1
\$10,000 TO \$20,000 .....	2
\$20,000 TO \$30,000 .....	3
\$30,000 TO \$50,000 .....	4
\$50,000 TO \$75,000 .....	5
\$75,000 TO \$100,000 .....	6
\$100,000 TO \$150,000, OR .....	7
OVER \$150,000 .....	8
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....	DK
REFUSED .....	REF

DO NOT READ {



170. How many children under the age of 18 live in this household?

# OF CHILDREN: \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE .....DK  
REFUSED .....REF

These are all the questions I have. Thank you very much for your cooperation. (**HANG UP**)

## Appendix B: Variance Measures Table

Population/ Subgroup	Survey Item	Proportion	Standard Error	Confidence Interval	Coefficient of Variation	Design Effect	N
<b>Overall</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	30.4%	0.01464	+/- 2.9%	0.04816	2.3	2,287
	Daily Smokers	21.6%	0.01322	+/- 2.6%	0.06118	2.4	2,287
	Non-Daily Smokers	8.7%	0.00879	+/- 1.7%	0.10101	2.2	2,287
	Non-smokers	69.6%	0.01464	+/- 2.9%	0.02103	2.3	2,287
	Former Smokers	27.8%	0.01408	+/- 2.8%	0.05066	2.3	2,287
	Never Smokers	41.8%	0.01563	+/- 3.1%	0.03740	2.3	2,287
	Smoking totally restricted at home	67.9%	0.01565	+/- 3.1%	0.02305	2.4	2,152
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	39.6%	0.01655	+/- 3.2%	0.04179	2.5	2,152
<b>Smokers</b>	All light smokers	70.2%	0.02726	+/- 5.3%	0.03883	2.1	587
	Light daily smokers	42.3%	0.02956	+/- 5.8%	0.06988	2.1	587
	Light non daily smokers	27.9%	0.02613	+/- 5.1%	0.09367	2.0	587
	Moderate smoker	22.6%	0.02509	+/- 4.9%	0.11100	2.1	587
	Heavy smokers	7.0%	0.01486	+/- 2.9%	0.21230	2.0	587
<b>Indoor workers</b>	Smoke-free workplace	96.6%	0.00772	+/- 1.5%	0.00799	2.3	1,245
<b>LGBT Men</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	27.4%	0.02174	+/- 4.3%	0.07933	2.8	1,192
	Daily Smokers	18.8%	0.01906	+/- 3.7%	0.10136	2.8	1,192
	Non-Daily Smokers	8.6%	0.01359	+/- 2.7%	0.15797	2.8	1,192
	Non-smokers	72.6%	0.02174	+/- 4.3%	0.02994	2.8	1,192
	Former Smokers	27.8%	0.02156	+/- 4.2%	0.07757	2.8	1,192
	Never Smokers	44.8%	0.02435	+/- 4.8%	0.05434	2.9	1,192
	Smoking totally restricted at home	66.7%	0.02413	+/- 4.7%	0.03617	3.0	1,131
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	38.0%	0.02553	+/- 5.0%	0.06718	3.1	1,131
<b>Smokers</b>	All light smokers	64.9%	0.04820	+/- 9.4%	0.07427	2.8	278
	Light daily smokers	35.2%	0.04787	+/- 9.4%	0.13600	2.8	278
	Light non daily smokers	29.7%	0.04704	+/- 9.2%	0.15839	2.9	278
	Moderate smoker	25.8%	0.04464	+/- 8.7%	0.17303	2.9	278
	Heavy smokers	9.0%	0.02665	+/- 5.2%	0.29609	2.4	278
<b>Indoor workers</b>	Smoke-free workplace	96.3%	0.01362	+/- 2.7%	0.01414	3.4	658

Population/ Subgroup	Survey Item	Proportion	Standard Error	Confidence Interval	Coefficient of Variation	Design Effect	N
<b>LGBT Women</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	32.5%	0.01965	+/- 3.9%	0.06047	1.9	1,095
	Daily Smokers	23.7%	0.01799	+/- 3.5%	0.07591	2.0	1,095
	Non-Daily Smokers	8.8%	0.01160	+/- 2.3%	0.13177	1.8	1,095
	Non-smokers	67.5%	0.01965	+/- 3.9%	0.02911	1.9	1,095
	Former Smokers	27.8%	0.01856	+/- 3.6%	0.06676	1.9	1,095
	Never Smokers	39.7%	0.02034	+/- 4.0%	0.05123	1.9	1,095
	Smoking totally restricted at home	68.8%	0.02054	+/- 4.0%	0.02986	2.0	1,021
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	40.7%	0.02182	+/- 4.3%	0.05361	2.0	1,021
Smokers	All light smokers	73.2%	0.03345	+/- 6.6%	0.04570	1.8	309
	Light daily smokers	46.4%	0.03730	+/- 7.3%	0.08040	1.7	309
	Light non daily smokers	26.9%	0.03216	+/- 6.3%	0.11954	1.6	309
	Moderate smoker	20.8%	0.03081	+/- 6.0%	0.14812	1.8	309
	Heavy smokers	5.9%	0.01785	+/- 3.5%	0.30255	1.8	309
Indoor workers	Smoke-free workplace	96.7%	0.00952	+/- 1.9%	0.00984	1.7	587
<b>Gay/Bisexual Men</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	27.7%	0.02995	+/- 5.9%	0.10813	4.3	970
	Smoking totally restricted at home	63.8%	0.03134	+/- 6.1%	0.04913	4.1	970
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	39.4%	0.03209	+/- 6.3%	0.08145	4.2	970
Smokers	All light smokers	70.5%	0.05315	+/- 10.4%	0.07539	3.2	237
Indoor Workers	Smoke-free workplace	97.3%	0.01156	+/- 2.3%	0.01188	3.0	587
<b>Lesbian/Bisexual Women</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	28.4%	0.03147	+/- 6.2%	0.11080	2.7	563
	Smoking totally restricted at home	73.1%	0.03027	+/- 5.9%	0.04141	2.6	563
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	41.4%	0.03427	+/- 6.7%	0.08278	2.7	563
Smokers	All light smokers	76.1%	0.05485	+/- 10.8%	0.07207	2.4	146
Indoor Workers	Smoke-free workplace	97.7%	0.00657	+/- 1.3%	0.00672	0.7	353

Population/ Subgroup	Survey Item	Proportion	Standard Error	Confidence Interval	Coefficient of Variation	Design Effect	N
<b>Other LGBT Men</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	26.5%	0.03880	+/- 7.6%	0.14640	1.2	161
	Smoking totally restricted at home	75.0%	0.03719	+/- 7.3%	0.04958	1.2	161
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	34.1%	0.04056	+/- 8.0%	0.11896	1.2	161
Smokers	All light smokers	48.1%	0.08052	+/- 15.8%	0.16741	1.1	41
Indoor Workers	Smoke-free workplace	92.3%	0.05348	+/- 10.5%	0.05794	2.9	71
<b>Other LGBT Women</b>							
Overall	Current Smokers	38.8%	0.02863	+/- 5.6%	0.07378	1.6	458
	Smoking totally restricted at home	64.3%	0.02817	+/- 5.5%	0.04380	1.6	458
	Exposed to smoke outside home or work	39.9%	0.02872	+/- 5.6%	0.07198	1.6	458
Smokers	All light smokers	71.0%	0.04319	+/- 8.5%	0.06082	1.5	163
Indoor Workers	Smoke-free workplace	95.4%	0.01789	+/- 3.5%	0.01876	1.7	234

## Appendix C:

### Summary Information about Other Published LGBT Studies

Author and Date	Study Overview and Sample Characteristics
Skinner and Otis, 1996	Self-administered questionnaires collected during the late 1980's of gay/lesbian respondents from mailing lists of LGBT organizations, from researcher referrals and from outreach during a pride parade.
Stall et al, 1999	Telephone surveys (N=2593) completed in 1992 with a random-digit-dial (RDD) household-based (n=696) of men who have sex with men (MSM), and self-administered questionnaires received from a convenience bar sample (1897) of similar respondents
Diamant et al., 2000	Self-administered questionnaires collected from a convenience sample (N=6935) of self-identified lesbians from national LGB magazines.
Valanis et al., 2000	Self-administered questionnaires from postmenopausal women (50-79) participating in 40 Women's Health Initiative Centers during 1993-1998. Of these participants, 264 were lifetime lesbians (sex only with women ever), 309 were lesbians (sex only with women after age 45), and 740 were bisexual women (sex with both men and women).
Aaron et al., 2001	Self-administered questionnaires collected from 1010 self-identified lesbian and bisexual women.
Cochran and Mays, 2001	Self-administered questionnaires completed by 11,876 self-identified lesbians from seven independently collected studies (1987-1996).
Gruskin et al., 2001	Self-administered questionnaires completed by 120 self-identified lesbians in a 1996 HMO health survey.
Greenwood et al., In press	1780 of 2402 (74%) men that were eligible for follow-up from a previously recruited probability sample completed tobacco surveys (1/99 – 12/99).
Tang et al., In press	California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), a population-based telephone survey was used to assess smoking prevalence and its correlates among respondents. Of 44606 respondents, 343 self-identified as lesbian; 593 self-identified as gay; and 793 identified themselves as bisexual (511 female and 282 male).

